

Ph.D. 13497

Thomas Cranmer's Register:

a record of archiepiscopal administration

in diocese and province



A dissertation submitted by Paul Ayris on 21 September 1984 for  
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Divinity,  
University of Cambridge, from Gonville and Caius College.

A B S T R A C T

Thomas Cranmer's Register in Lambeth Palace Library forms an important record of the archbishop's administration in diocese and province. Called from relative obscurity in 1533 to be archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer was thrust into the heady world of Tudor politics.

The government's use of the archbishop's diocesan and metropolitical jurisdiction enabled them to control that prelate's powers to enforce the political settlement in the country. With the creation of the Vice-Gerency, the archbishop of Canterbury was no longer the principal minister of the King's spiritual jurisdiction. Cromwell used his office as Vice-Gerent with skill and insight to place the authority of the English episcopate upon new foundations. He himself was able to supplement the jurisdiction of the archbishop as metropolitan.

Thomas Cranmer's Commonplace Books give evidence of his efforts to elaborate a doctrine of Christian Obedience. The Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum shows that by the 1550s, Thomas Cranmer had evolved a careful plan to reform the administration of the English church. The key to such an attempt was the archbishop's concept of ministry.

Thomas Cranmer was able to implement certain reforms in diocese and province and he used traditional administrative practices to achieve that end. It is clear, nonetheless, that there are many parallels in Cranmer's Register



with the Registers of his mediaeval forbears. The theological and political reformation of the sixteenth century left unchanged certain aspects of ecclesiastical administration and discipline.

In asserting its supremacy within the English church, the Tudor monarchy strove to extirpate Roman jurisdiction in England. Cranmer fully accepted such claims on theological grounds and strove to implement in diocese and province spiritual and administrative reforms grounded in the tenets of the New Divinity. Such developments find no parallel in mediaeval episcopal Registers. The Reformatio Legum records Cranmer's mature ideas concerning administration and discipline in the English church.

C O N T E N T S

Abstract	ii
Contents	iv
Preface	vi
Table of Abbreviations	ix
Introduction	xvi

Part One

I. 'A register or treasury...of God's holy will': Towards a study of Thomas Cranmer's episcopal <u>Register</u>	2
--	---

Part Two

II. 'God's vice-gerent and Christ's vicar': the relationship between the crown and the archbishopric of Canterbury 1533-53	59
III. Supremacy and Obedience: Thomas Cranmer's concept of Church and State	113

Part Three

IV. Continuity and Change: the appointment of Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury	166
V. Thomas Cranmer as bishop of the diocese of Canterbury	192

VI. 'The most principal minister of our spiritual jurisdiction': Thomas Cranmer as metropolitan of the province of Canterbury	227
VII. Power and Protest: the exercise of metropolitanical jurisdiction in Thomas Cranmer's <u>Register</u>	260

Part Four

VIII. 'God's holy will': Thomas Cranmer and the <u>Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum</u>	313
Conclusion	361
Appendix	363
Bibliography	552

P R E F A C E

The work for this thesis, submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the university of Cambridge, was begun in 1979 under the supervision of Dr P.N. Brooks. I wish to extend my thanks to a supervisor who always knew when to encourage and when to restrain his student. During the course of my research, I have incurred debts to Mrs D.M. Owen and to Professor C.N.L. Brooke. Mrs Owen was the first to reveal to the author the mysterious world of ecclesiastical archives. Professor Brooke has helped unflinching in adding valuable mediaeval perspective.

I also wish to record my thanks to librarians of university libraries and archivists of diocesan archives. The librarians of Cambridge University Library, amongst whom I was privileged to work as a member of their staff for the period 1978-79, have always produced volumes large and small quickly and efficiently. Thanks are also due to the librarians of The Bodleian Library, Oxford, Sheffield University Library and The John Rylands University Library of Manchester. My work in diocesan record offices has been facilitated by the unfailing help and enthusiasm of the archivists who have custody of the records. I therefore wish to record my thanks to the staff of The Department of Manuscripts in The British Library, of The Round Room in The Public Record Office, of Lambeth Palace Library, The Borthwick

Institute of Historical Research in the university of York, the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Lincoln Archive Office, the Norfolk and Norwich Record Office, Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library, and The Guildhall Library in London.

Special debts have also been incurred during the composition of this work. For help in various ways, I wish to record my thanks to Dr D.M. Smith, Dr W.J. Sheils, Mr A.J. Fletcher, Professor J. Atkinson, Professor D.M. Loades, Mr G. Widermann and Mr M.C. Banner. I am especially grateful to Dr C.R. Elrington for permission to use the map of the diocese of Canterbury which appears in The Victoria History of the Counties of England.<sup>1</sup> The map which appears in my thesis was copied by Mrs K. Herrick. I also wish to record my thanks to the Trustees of The Bethune-Baker Fund in The Divinity School, university of Cambridge, for financial assistance during my research in diocesan archives.

The current state of research, the nature of my own investigations and the sources used are fully explained in Part One of this thesis. The chapters of analysis attempt to investigate the principle and practice which lie behind Thomas Cranmer's Register. The conclusion briefly summarises

---

<sup>1</sup>The Victoria History of the County of Kent, vol. II, ed. by W. Page (London, 1926), facing p. 112.

the results of my investigation. The Appendix contains transcripts and calendars from the Register. Documents from Thomas Cromwell's Register as Vice-Cherent are also included. Rules for transcription are set out in a Preface to the Appendix. All manuscript and printed sources used in the compilation of my work are listed in the Bibliography. Abbreviations used are listed in a separate Table. In dating documents from manuscript and early printed sources, dates are given in the Old Style and the year has been taken to begin on 1 January.

The text of my dissertation does not exceed 80, 000 words. The Appendix of 40, 000 words, comprising unpublished primary source material, is included by permission of the Degree Committee for the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge.

I am happy to affirm that my dissertation is in its entirety the product of my own original research and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration.

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

- A.P.C. Acts of the Privy Council of England A.D.  
1542-1631, New Series, 46 vols(London, 1890-  
1964)
- B.I. The Borthwick Institute of Historical Research,  
York University
- B.L. The British Library
- Add. MS. Additional MS.
- Harl. MS. Harleian MS.
- Bodl. The Bodleian Library, Oxford
- Bowker, Reformation  
M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: The  
diocese of Lincoln under John Longland  
1521-47(Cambridge, 1981)
- Burnet, Hist. Ref.  
G. Burnet, History of the reformation of the  
Church of England, ed. in 7 vols by N. Pocock  
(Oxford, 1865)
- C.C.A.L. Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library

C.C.C.C. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

Chich. R. The Register of Henry Chichele, archbishop of  
Canterbury 1414-43, ed. in 4 vols by E.F. Jacob  
and H.C. Johnson (Canterbury and York Society,  
42, 45-7, 1937-47)

Churchill, Administration

I.J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration,  
2 vols (London, 1933)

Clerke and Knyght

The Registers of Thomas Wolsey, Bishop of Bath  
and Wells, 1518-23, John Clerke, Bishop of Bath  
and Wells, 1523-1541, William Knyght, Bishop  
of Bath and Wells, 1541-1547, and Gilbert  
Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1554-1559,  
ed. by H. Maxwell-Lyte (Somerset Record Society,  
55, 1940)

C.P.R. Edward VI

Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the  
Public Record Office: Edward VI, 6 vols  
(London, 1924-29)

C.S.P.

Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers  
relating to the negotiations between England  
and Spain [from the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII,  
Edward VI and Mary, 1485-1558], ed. in 13 vols



(x)

C.C.C.C. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

Chich. R. The Register of Henry Chichele, archbishop of  
Canterbury 1414-43, ed. in 4 vols by E.F. Jacob  
and H.C. Johnson (Canterbury and York Society,  
42, 45-7, 1937-47)

Churchill, Administration

I.J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration,  
2 vols (London, 1933)

Clerke and Knyght

The Registers of Thomas Wolsey, Bishop of Bath  
and Wells, 1518-23, John Clerke, Bishop of Bath  
and Wells, 1523-1541, William Knyght, Bishop  
of Bath and Wells, 1541-1547, and Gilbert  
Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1554-1559,  
ed. by H. Maxwell-Lyte (Somerset Record Society,  
55, 1940)

C.P.R. Edward VI

Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the  
Public Record Office: Edward VI, 6 vols  
(London, 1924-29)

C.S.P.

Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers  
relating to the negotiations between England  
and Spain [from the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII,  
Edward VI and Mary, 1485-1558], ed. in 13 vols

by G. Bergenroth, P. de Gayangos, M.A.S. Hume  
and R. Tyler(London, 1862-1954) and 2 supplements  
ed. by G.A. Bergenroth and G. Mattingly  
(London, 1868-1940)

D.N.B.            Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by  
L. Stephen and S. Lee, 72 vols(London, 1885-  
1913)

E.H.R.            English Historical Review

Elton, P & P    G.R. Elton, Policy and Police(Cambridge, 1972)

Foxe, A & M    J. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, ed. in 8 vols  
by J. Pratt(London, 1877)

Gee and Hardy, Documents  
H. Gee and W.J. Hardy, Documents illustrative  
of English Church History(London, 1896)

G.L.              Guildhall Library, Aldermanbury, London

H.B.C.            Handbook of British Chronology, ed. by  
Sir F.M. Powicke and E.B. Fryde, 2nd ed.  
(London, 1961)

Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations

P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin, Tudor Royal  
Proclamations, 3 vols(New Haven, 1964-69)

L.A.O. Lincoln Archive Office

J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541

J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-  
1541, revised and expanded in 12 vols(London,  
1962-7)

J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857

J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-  
1857, revised and expanded, vol. 1-(London,  
1969-)

L.P. Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of  
the reign of Henry VIII [A Calendar], ed. by  
J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner and R.H. Brodie, 21 vols  
(London, 1862-1910); vol. 1[revised ed.](1920);  
Addenda 1 vol.(1929-32)

L.P.L. Lambeth Palace Library

C.M. Carte Antique et Miscellaneae

C.R. Thomas Cranmer's Register

K.R. John Kempe's Register

M.R. John Morton's Register

S.R. John Stafford's Register

- W.R. William Warham's Register
- L.W. M. Luther, Works, 54 vols and 1 companion vol.  
under the general editorship of J. Pelikan  
and H.T. Lehmann (St Louis, 1955-75)
- N.N.R.O. Norfolk and Norwich Record Office
- Pocock, Rec. Ref.  
N. Pocock, Records of the Reformation: The  
Divorce 1527-1533, 2 vols (Oxford, 1870)
- P.R.O. Public Record Office
- P.S., Cranmer I  
Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer,  
archbishop of Canterbury, martyr, 1556, relative  
to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ed. for  
The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge, 1844)
- P.S., Cranmer II  
Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas  
Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, martyr, 1556,  
ed. for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge,  
1846)
- P.S., Liturgies  
The Two Liturgies A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552:

with other documents set forth by authority in  
the reign of Edward VI, ed. for The Parker  
Society by J. Ketley(Cambridge, 1844)

R.L.E.      The Reformation of The Ecclesiastical Laws  
as attempted in the reigns of King Henry VIII,  
King Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth, a new  
edition by E. Cardwell(Oxford, 1850)

Rymer, Foedera  
T. Rymer, Foedera, conventiones, literae et  
cujuscunque generis acta publica, 20 vols  
(vols 16-20 ed. by R. Sanderson)(London,  
1704-35)

Scarisbrick, Henry VIII  
J.J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII(London, 1968)

Smith, Registers  
D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of  
England and Wales(London, 1981)

St. P.      State Papers...King Henry the Eighth, 11 vols  
(London, 1830-52)

Stat. Realm      Statutes of the Realm, compiled in 11 vols  
by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins, J. Raithby et al.  
(London, 1810-28)

Statutes            Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford, 3 vols  
(London, 1853)

Strype, Cranmer

J. Strype, Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer,  
3 vols(Oxford, 1848-54)

Strype, Cranmer, vol. III A & A

J. Strype, Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer,  
vol. III Appendix and Addenda

Strype, Eccl. Mem.

J. Strype, Ecclesiastical memorials relating  
chiefly to religion and the reformation of it  
...under...Henry VIII...Edward VI...and Mary I.  
3 vols in 6(Oxford, 1822)

U.L.C.            University Library of Cambridge

E.D.R.            Ely Diocesan Records

E.P.R.            Ely Probate Records

V.E.            Valor Ecclesiasticus, ed. in 6 vols by J. Caley  
and J. Hunter(London, 1810-34)

Wilkins, Concilia

D. Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniae et  
Hiberniae, 4 vols(London, 1737)

W.S.R.O.        West Sussex Record Office, Chichester

INTRODUCTION

On 15 May 1532, the upper house of convocation gave their agreement to the document known as the Submission of the Clergy. They promised that convocation would be summoned only by royal writ. No new canons were to be enacted without royal assent and all existing canons were to be submitted for scrutiny to a committee appointed by the King. Such a momentous declaration was passed only by the upper, not the lower, house of convocation. As Dr Michael Kelly has shown, the legislative freedom of the English church was yielded to the government by a rump convocation.<sup>1</sup>

William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, died in August 1532.<sup>2</sup> He had earlier attempted to resist royal pressure. In an aggressive speech, apparently never delivered, dating from March/April 1532, Warham had warned of divine punishments for those who threatened the Church.<sup>3</sup> Warham's death removed him from the earthly arena and enabled the King to appoint a metropolitan at Canterbury who was more sympathetic to his views.

The man eventually chosen as Warham's successor was Thomas Cranmer. He had come to the attention of the

---

<sup>1</sup> M.J. Kelly, 'The Submission of the Clergy' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, vol. XV[Fifth Series](1965), pp. 97-119.

<sup>2</sup> Dictionary of National Biography, ed. in 72 vols by L. Stephen and S. Lee(London, 1885-1913), sub nomine.

<sup>3</sup> Warham's Defence, ed. by J. Moyes in Dublin Review, vol. CXIV (1894), pp. 401-14; of. Kelly, art. cit., p. 103 n. 3.

King in 1529 with advanced views concerning the King's marital cause. According to Ralph Morice, the archbishop's secretary, Cranmer told Stephen Gardiner and Edward Foxe that the matter was not one for canon lawyers but theologians.<sup>4</sup> At the time of his elevation, Cranmer was a mere archdeacon.<sup>5</sup> It seems clear that he owed his appointment to his views on the divorce. By the time of his provision to the see of Canterbury in February 1533,<sup>6</sup> Thomas Cromwell was already at work on the great Act in Restraint of Appeals.<sup>7</sup> In its claim that the realm of England 'is an empire', Cromwell proclaimed the jurisdictional independence of the Church in England. The immediate purpose of the act was to forestall any attempt by Catherine of Aragon to appeal from the court over which Cranmer was to preside to determine the King's marital cause.<sup>8</sup> Anne Boleyn was married to the King in January 1533 when she was already with child.<sup>9</sup> Thomas Cranmer was placed at the centre of this heady world of politics by his appointment to the see of Canterbury.

---

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Narratives of the days of the Reformation, ed. by J.G. Nichols (Camden Society Publications, 77, 1859), p. 242.

<sup>5</sup>J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, 12 vols (London, 1962-7), vol. VIII, p. 17. The date of his appointment is unclear.

<sup>6</sup>Lambeth Palace Library, Thomas Cranmer's Register, fols 1-5v.

<sup>7</sup>G.R. Elton, 'The evolution of a Reformation Statute' in Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1974-83), vol. II, pp. 82-106; for a different view of the importance of the statute, cf. J.J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII (London, 1968), pp. 311-28. Cf. also Statutes of the Realm, compiled in 11 vols by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins, J. Raithby et al. (London, 1810-28), III, pp. 427-9.

<sup>8</sup>Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, martyr, 1556, ed. for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge, 1846), pp. 243-4.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 246.



It is within his archiepiscopal Register that the records  
of Cranmer's rule in diocese and province are to be found.

## PART ONE

UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
CAMBRIDGE

'A register of treasury...of God's holy will': Towards a study of Thomas Cranmer's episcopal Register.

This church is...a register or treasury to keep the books of God's holy will and testament, and to rest only thereupon...<sup>1</sup>

In his Answer to Smith's Preface,<sup>2</sup> the archbishop of Canterbury carefully enunciated his ideal of the visible Church. In elucidating such a concept, Thomas Cranmer gave clear evidence concerning his motives in the compilation of the records concerning his administrative acta which are preserved within his archiepiscopal Register.

The earliest surviving Register in Lambeth Palace Library, the repository of the archbishops of Canterbury, is that of John Pecham who was archbishop from 1279 to 1292.<sup>3</sup> Dr David Smith has rejected suggestions that Robert Kilwardby (1273-8) possessed a formal Register which he took to Rome.<sup>4</sup> From the time of Pecham onwards, such documents exist in a continuous series with occasional gaps.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. ed. for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge, 1844), p. 377.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 368-79.

<sup>3</sup>Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham, Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis. edited in 3 vols by C.T. Martin (Rolls Series, 1882-5). All missing entries are printed in The Register of John Pecham, Archbishop of Canterbury 1279-1292, edited in 2 vols by F.N. Davis, D.L. Douie et al. (Canterbury and York Society, 64-5, 1908-69).

<sup>4</sup>D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales (London, 1981), p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. ibid.

When Fowler compiled his booklet Episcopal Registers of England and Wales,<sup>6</sup> he could say that the number of scholars who had worked on such documents had not been great.<sup>7</sup> He surveyed the existing manuscripts in episcopal registries and noted where documents had been published. It was not until 1872 that a Register was published in a complete form. In that year, Raine published The Register or Rolls of Walter Gray.<sup>8</sup> With the formation of The Canterbury and York Society in 1904, such documents have appeared in print in increasing numbers and the society has seventy three publications to its credit.<sup>9</sup>

Since the appearance of Fowler's work in 1918, the published literature on episcopal Registers as a genre has grown. In 1933, Miss I.J. Churchill made an important contribution to the subject when she published Canterbury Administration.<sup>10</sup> She produced an important analysis of the contents of the Canterbury Registers down to the archiepiscopate of William Warham. In 1960, she published a short article on archiepiscopal Registers for a collection of studies concerned with the mediaeval records of

<sup>6</sup> R.C. Fowler, Episcopal Registers of England and Wales (London, 1918).

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>8</sup> The register, or rolls, of Walter Gray, lord archbishop of York: with appendices of illustrative documents, edited by J. Raine (Surtees Society, 56, 1872).

<sup>9</sup> The Canterbury and York Society [Annual Bulletin], 1983, pp. [1] and 5-6.

<sup>10</sup> I.J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration, 2 vols (London, 1933).

the archbishopric.<sup>11</sup> Professor C.R. Cheney made a valuable study of the subject of episcopal registration.<sup>12</sup> E.F. Jacob made an important comparative study of the Registers of Canterbury and York in his The Medieval Registers of Canterbury and York.<sup>13</sup> Several studies based upon episcopal registration have unravelled the technical complexities of such documents. Purvis' Introduction to Ecclesiastical Records analysed the types of documents to be discovered in such manuscripts.<sup>14</sup> Offer gave English translations of certain types of record.<sup>15</sup> More recently, the nature of existing episcopal Registers has been treated in three important works by Mrs D.M. Owen and Dr D. Smith.<sup>16</sup>

Amongst those engaged in Cranmer Studies, the importance of the material contained within Thomas Cranmer's Register has not been fully appreciated. Thomas Cranmer himself, moreover, has received a bad press at the hands of his biographers. The first published biography appeared

---

<sup>11</sup>I.J. Churchill, 'The Archbishops' Registers' in Mediaeval Records of the Archbishops of Canterbury(London, 1962), pp. 11-20.

<sup>12</sup>C.R. Cheney, English Bishops' Chanceries 1100-1250 (Manchester, 1950), esp. pp. 100-10.

<sup>13</sup>E.F. Jacob, The Medieval Registers of Canterbury and York(York, 1953).

<sup>14</sup>J. Purvis, An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Records (London, 1953).

<sup>15</sup>C.J. Offer, The Bishop's Register(London, 1929).

<sup>16</sup>D.M. Owen, The Records of the Established Church in England(London, 1970); D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales(London, 1981); D.M. Owen, Medieval Records in Print: Bishops' Registers(London, 1982).

from the pen of John Strype in 1694.<sup>17</sup> In the sixteenth century, however, John Foxe included an important appreciation of the archbishop in his Acts and Monuments.<sup>18</sup> Since Strype's work, over fifteen full-length biographies have appeared.<sup>19</sup> The best work is that by Pollard, although that great Tudor historian was reluctant to make extensive use of unpublished manuscript sources. Later work has failed to replace his interpretation. Mr Theodore Maynard's work is clearly written for the faithful of the Roman fold.

---

<sup>17</sup> J. Strype, Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer (London, 1694); the standard edition of this work is J. Strype, Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer, 3 vols published for The Ecclesiastical History Society (Oxford, 1848-54).

<sup>18</sup> J. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, edited in 8 vols by J. Pratt (London, 1877), vol. VIII, pp. 3-101.

<sup>19</sup> W. Gilpin, The Life of Thomas Cranmer (London, 1784); C.W. Le Bas, The Life of Archbishop Cranmer, 2 vols (London, 1833); J.A. Sargant, The Life of Archbishop Cranmer (London, 1829); H.J. Todd, The Life of Archbishop Cranmer, 2 vols (London, 1831); H.F. Lee, The Life and Times of Thomas Cranmer (Boston, 1841); W. Marshall, The Story of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury (Edinburgh, 1876); C.H. Colette, The Life, Times and Writings of Thomas Cranmer (London, 1887); A.J. Mason, Thomas Cranmer (London, 1898); A.D. Innes, Cranmer and the Reformation in England (Edinburgh, 1900); A.F. Pollard, Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation 1489-1556 (London, 1904) with a new edition (London, 1926); A.C. Deane, The Life of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury (London, 1927); J.H.P. Belloc, Cranmer (London, 1931); R.G. Martin, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury ([none given], 1939); F.E. Hutchinson, Cranmer and the English Reformation (London, 1951); M.L. Loane, Masters of the English Reformation (London, 1954); T. Maynard, The Life of Thomas Cranmer (London, 1956); G.W. Bromiley, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop and Martyr (London, 1956); J.G. Ridley, Thomas Cranmer (Oxford, 1962).

Mr Maynard confessed to 'like best a Catholic priest who sinks his nationality in his office...Thomas Cranmer was too much an English parson'.<sup>20</sup> Mr Jasper Ridley's work is thorough, but his historical judgement lacks insight. In his assessment of Cranmer's doctrine of Christian Obedience, for example, he maintained that the archbishop's views were shaped by the politicians at the Tudor court rather than by his theological studies.<sup>21</sup> Professor E.G. Rupp has rightly stressed that Cranmer's doctrine of the Godly Prince was of great importance in his theology.<sup>22</sup> Mr Ridley's biography does less than justice to the archbishop for it seems to indicate that the archbishop did not know his own mind.<sup>23</sup>

If Cranmer's biographers have failed to penetrate to the heart of the man, much modern research has naturally concentrated upon the evolution of the archbishop's theological ideas. No monograph, however, expounds Cranmer's doctrines of Christian Obedience and Christian Discipline. In 1915, Legg published Cranmer's liturgical projects from a manuscript in The British Library.<sup>24</sup> There is a growing recognition among scholars that the archbishop's thought should be studied in the context of the continental Reformation.

<sup>20</sup> Maynard, op. cit., p. 10.

<sup>21</sup> Ridley, op. cit., p. 65.

<sup>22</sup> E.G. Rupp, Six Makers of English Religion 1500-1700 (London, 1957), p. 41.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. P.N. Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist (London, 1965), p. 110 n. 1.

<sup>24</sup> Cranmer's liturgical projects, edited for The Henry Bradshaw Society by J.W. Legg (London, 1915)

In 1960, Dr P.N. Brooks presented a doctoral thesis in which he illustrated Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the sacraments.<sup>25</sup> In 1965, he published a study of Thomas Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine which broke new ground.<sup>26</sup> This work made use of unpublished manuscript material from the archbishop's massive Commonplace Books in The British Library<sup>27</sup> and a collection of sacramental Commonplaces entitled De re Sacramentaria in The Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.<sup>28</sup> Dr Brooks properly studied the evolution of the archbishop's thought in the context of the continental Reformation. When Cranmer moved from the received Roman doctrine of transubstantiation to embrace a concept of the 'real presence' in the Eucharist, he made use of patristic citations in the Dialogus of John Oecolampadius. Dr Brooks has shown, however, that Cranmer at this time held a Eucharistic doctrine quite contrary to that of Oecolampadius himself.<sup>29</sup> Important assessments of Cranmer's liturgical work have been made.<sup>30</sup> Dr Bromiley's

---

<sup>25</sup> P.N. Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the sacraments (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1960).

<sup>26</sup> P.N. Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist (London, 1965).

<sup>27</sup> British Library, MSS. Royal 7B XI and XII.

<sup>28</sup> Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 102, fols 151-93.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. P.N. Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist (London, 1965), pp. 34-5.

<sup>30</sup> F.E. Brightman, The English Rite, 2 vols, 2nd rev. ed. (Farnborough, 1970); E.C. Ratoliff, The booke of common prayer of the Church of England: its making and revisions M.D. xlix-M.D. clxi (London, 1949); E.C. Ratoliff, 'The liturgical work of Archbishop Cranmer' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. VII (1956), pp. 189-203.



study of Cranmer's theology is very disappointing since it rests solely on published material.<sup>31</sup> Burbidge has assembled a catalogue of Thomas Cranmer's library.<sup>32</sup> The archbishop's collections of books and manuscripts were enormous. Burbidge's list contains 42 manuscripts comprising 93 separate works and 369 printed books containing 355 works.

Little has appeared on Cranmer's administrative acta during his tenure of the see of Canterbury. Bailey wrote on the legal aspects of Cranmer's death in 1556.<sup>33</sup> More recently, Professor du Boulay has compiled an account of the temporalities of the see of Canterbury under Cranmer's rule.<sup>34</sup> Professor du Boulay demonstrated that Cranmer was forced to part with many of the mediaeval temporalities of the see in a series of forced exchanges with the King. Much of the property he received in return consisted of appropriated rectories. In 1850, Cardwell produced a new edition of Cranmer's Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.<sup>35</sup> Three important studies

---

<sup>31</sup>G.W. Bromiley, Thomas Cranmer, theologian(London, 1956). It is as a theologian that the archbishop has received treatment in several outstanding surveys of the English Reformation. Cf. A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation(London, 1964); E.G. Rupp, Six Makers of English Religion 1500-1700(London, 1957); T.M. Parker, The English Reformation to 1558, 2nd ed.(Oxford, 1966). W.O. Chadwick, The Reformation(Harmondsworth, 1964).

<sup>32</sup>E. Burbidge, [Remains of the library of T. Cranmer], [(London, 1892)].

<sup>33</sup>A. Bailey, 'A legal view of Cranmer's execution' in English Historical Review, vol. VII(1892), pp. 466-70.

<sup>34</sup>F.R.H. du Boulay, 'Archbishop Cranmer and the Canterbury temporalities' in English Historical Review, vol. 67(1952), pp. 19-36.

<sup>35</sup>The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws as attempted in the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth, a new edition by E. Cardwell(Oxford, 1850).

have been published on the archbishop's attempts to reform the Roman code of canon law. Except for the work of Sir Lewis Dibdin, none of the writers has fully appreciated the legal and administrative background of the new code.<sup>36</sup> The sole study of Thomas Cranmer's Register is that made by Mr A.J. Edwards on the archbishop's sede vacante administration.<sup>37</sup> Mr Edwards concentrated upon the institutions to benefices to be found within the Register. Dr David Chambers has provided an important analysis of Thomas Cranmer's faculty office and has edited the first two Faculty Office Registers.<sup>38</sup> The principal sorts of licences issued by the faculty office were dispensations for marriage, plurality and non-residence. Capacities were also issued for the regular clergy to hold benefices and to leave their religion. The latter are the most important of all the dispensations issued by the faculty office at this time.

Whilst many mediaeval episcopal Registers have appeared in print, little has been done concerning the deposit of Reformation Registers in episcopal archives for the province of Canterbury. The Hereford Registers of Charles Booth(1516-35),

<sup>36</sup> L.T. Dibdin, English Church Law and Divorce(London, 1912); J.C. Spalding, 'The Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum of 1552 and the furthering of discipline in England' in Church History, vol. 39(1970), pp. 162-71; J.P. Forman, 'Cranmer, Tudor Diplomacy and Primitive Discipline' in Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, ed. by C.S. Meyer, vol. I-(Saint Louis, [none given]), II, pp. 108-18.

<sup>37</sup> A.J. Edwards, The Sede Vacante administration of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer 1533-53(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the M. Phil. degree, university of London, 1968).

<sup>38</sup> D.S. Chambers, Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549(Oxford, 1966). This work supersedes W.Hooper, 'The Court of Faculties' in English Historical Review, vol. XXV(1910), pp. 670-86.

Edward Fox(1535-8) and Edmund Bonner(1539) were published by Bannister in 1921.<sup>39</sup> Those of Fox and Bonner are inferior productions since they were printed as an appendix to Booth's Register. The see of Bath and Wells is well represented in print at this period. The Registers of John Clerke(1523-41), William Knight(1541-47) and Gilbert Bourne(1554-59) have all been edited by Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte.<sup>40</sup> Thomas Goodrich's Register at Ely(1534-54) has been published in calendared form in the Ely Diocesan Remembrancer. The Registers of Thomas Thirlby(1555-59) and Richard Cox(1559-1581) have been similarly treated.<sup>41</sup> At Winchester, the Registers of Stephen Gardiner and John Ponet were transcribed by Chitty for The Canterbury and York Society.<sup>42</sup> John White's Register has also appeared in print.<sup>43</sup> The most important Register to be published is that of Matthew Parker, who was the first Elizabethan archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>44</sup> The standard of editing in this work is not impeccable, but the editor has provided access to a wealth of material.

<sup>39</sup>Registrum Caroli Bothe, episcopi Herefordensis A.D. MDXVI-MDXXXIV, edited by A.T. Bannister(Cantilupe and Canterbury and York Societies, 28, 1921). Fox's Register appears on pp. 361-82 and Bonner's on pp. 383-5.

<sup>40</sup>The Registers of Thomas Wolsey, Bishop of Bath and Wells. 1518-1523. John Clerke, Bishop of Bath and Wells. 1523-1541. William Knight, Bishop of Bath and Wells. 1541-1547. and Gilbert Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells. 1554-1559, ed. by H. Maxwell-Lyte(Somerset Record Society, 55, 1940).

<sup>41</sup>Ely Diocesan Remembrancer, 319(new series 72, Dec. 1911) - 355(new series 108, Dec. 1914).

<sup>42</sup>Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynt, episcoporum Wintoniensium, ed. by H.E. Malden and H. Chitty(Canterbury and York Society, 37, 1930).

<sup>43</sup>Registrum Johannis Whyte, episcopi Wintoniensis A.D. MDLVI - MDLIX, ed. by H. Chitty(Canterbury and York Society, 16, 1914).

<sup>44</sup>Registrum Mathei Parker, Diocesis Cantuariensis A.D.

If few episcopal Registers have appeared in print for the early Reformation period, more is known concerning the state of the English church in the late mediaeval and early modern periods through important local studies and articles. Dr Lander has shown that Sherborne's episcopate in the diocese of Chichester brought important reforms to that see. By his personal presence in the diocese, Sherborne was able to reform the church courts.<sup>45</sup> He was also able to carry out further reforms. In his cathedral church, he endowed new prebends and paid for decorations and repairs to the fabric.<sup>46</sup> Dr Lander has also shown that probate jurisdiction operated efficiently during the years of Sherborne's episcopate.<sup>47</sup> Dr Lander posited two reasons why Sherborne's successors were unable to continue his reforms. The authority of the episcopate was undermined by the political reformation and future bishops were impeded in attempts to pursue reform by local opposition and rising inflation.<sup>48</sup>

Professor J.J. Scarisbrick has shown that many of the diocesan bishops were actually resident in their sees in the years preceding the Reformation. By 1530, only one

---

1559-1575, edited in 3 vols by E.M. Thompson and W.H. Frere (Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33).

<sup>45</sup> S.J. Lander, The Diocese of Chichester, 1508-1558: Episcopal Reform under Robert Sherburne and its Aftermath (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1974), pp. 25-93. Cf. S. Lander, 'Church courts and the Reformation in the diocese of Chichester, 1500-58' in Continuity and Change, ed. by R. O'Day and F. Heal (Leicester, 1976), pp. 215-37.

<sup>46</sup> Lander, op. cit., pp. 136-62.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., pp. 360-7.

bishop remained who is known to have performed strictly secular duties. This was Veysey, who was president in the West. The remainder, including men of the calibre of Fisher and Warham, had ceased to be engaged in public affairs. The supremacy of Wolsey within the English church had displaced many from influence.<sup>49</sup> Dr Michael Kelly has provided an important picture of Canterbury jurisdiction and influence during the episcopate of William Warham. Warham's right of presentation extended to roughly one quarter of all known positions in the diocese.<sup>50</sup> In Chichester diocese, Sherborne presented to 18.75% of all benefices with cure.<sup>51</sup> In Lincoln diocese during the period 1521-35, Dr Bowker has shown that churchmen presented to only 6.5% of rectories and to 5.9% of vicarages. The patrons with the largest proportion of patronage were religious houses, which presented to 15.2% of rectories and to 25.4% of vicarages.<sup>52</sup> The same is true of Chichester diocese during the period 1508-36. Religious houses presented to 34% of all benefices with cure and were the group which possessed the greatest share of patronage.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, The Conservative Episcopate in England 1529-1535 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1955), pp. 63-9.

<sup>50</sup> M.J. Kelly, Canterbury Jurisdiction and influence during the episcopate of William Warham, 1503-1532 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1963), p. 14.

<sup>51</sup> Lander, op. cit., p. 200.

<sup>52</sup> M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: the diocese of Lincoln under John Longland 1521-1547 (Cambridge, 1981), p. 123.

<sup>53</sup> Lander, loc. cit.

Dr Kelly has shown that Wolsey's position as papal legate virtually destroyed the archbishop of Canterbury's authority. Wolsey entered into a composition with Warham concerning probate jurisdiction. He also exercised powers of visitation and asserted a right to hold visitations sede vacante. At Worcester in the vacancy of 1522-3, for example, Warham was unable to administer the diocese. Dispensations were also issued by the legate which diverted money due to Rome into his own coffers. He also used his legatine rights to pre-empt benefices in the gift of other ecclesiastics.<sup>54</sup> Any estimate of Warham's position, however, must be based on the Submission of the Clergy in 1532. By the terms of the Submission, convocation promised to enact no new canons and to submit existing constitutions to the scrutiny of the King. Such a Submission was enacted by a 'rump' convocation. Ultimately, it proved to be the death stroke to convocation's legislative independence. On 16 May 1532, however, it seemed to be a 'blundering, and legally suspect victory'.<sup>55</sup>

Concerning the establishment of the royal supremacy, firm battle lines have been drawn by many scholars. Professor

---

<sup>54</sup>M.J. Kelly, Canterbury Jurisdiction and influence during the episcopate of William Warham, 1503-1532(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1963), pp. 148-207. Cf. G.R. Elton, Reform and Reformation(London, 1977), pp. 92-3.

<sup>55</sup>M.J. Kelly, 'The Submission of the Clergy' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, XV[Fifth Series](1965), pp. 97-119.

Elton has maintained that the decade after 1530 witnessed the establishment of national sovereignty achieved by a recognition that parliamentary statute was supreme. This was a revolution which was piloted by Thomas Cromwell alone. There were consequent revolutions in the machinery of government.<sup>56</sup> Replies to Professor Elton's position have appeared.<sup>57</sup> Dr Harriss has altered the context of the debate by studying the mediaeval background to the changes of the 1530s. He has also argued that the responsibility for the break with Rome in the 1530s is not Thomas Cromwell's alone. He has pleaded for a unity of purpose in the government's policies between 1529 and 1534. Dr Penry Williams has also replied to Professor Elton's thesis concerning the administrative machinery of the English state.<sup>58</sup> Professor Elton has replied to such criticisms in an article entitled The Tudor Revolution: A Reply.<sup>59</sup> In this article, Professor Elton maintained the substance of his thesis. Further criticisms of Professor Elton's interpretation have been made. Professor J.J. Scarisbrick has questioned both the pace of change and the absolute responsibility of Thomas Cromwell as

---

<sup>56</sup> The main works in which Professor Elton has expounded the view are listed in P. Williams, 'A Revolution in Tudor History?' in Past and Present, vol. 25 (July, 1963), p. 4. To this list should be added further works: Policy and Police (Cambridge, 1972); Reform and Reformation (London, 1977); The Tudor Constitution, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1982); 'Thomas Cromwell Redivivus' in Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte, vol. 68 (1977), pp. 192-208.

<sup>57</sup> G.L. Harriss, 'Medieval Government and Statecraft' in Past and Present, vol. 25 (July, 1963), pp. 8-39.

<sup>58</sup> P. Williams, 'The Tudor State' in ibid., pp. 39-58.

<sup>59</sup> G.R. Elton, 'The Tudor Revolution: A Reply' in Past and Present, vol. 29 (December, 1964), pp. 26-49.

its author. He has pleaded for a more gradual political reform over the period 1529-35. For example, Professor Elton has claimed that the Act in Restraint of Appeals is the pivot around which the government's policy turned. In its claim that the realm of England is an Empire, the act embodied Thomas Cromwell's notions of national sovereignty. Professor Scarisbrick, however, has rightly claimed that the imperial argument was not a Cromwellian innovation. It is true that the actual noun Empire is new, but it cannot be said that it was greatly used after the passage of the statute. The immediate purpose of the act, moreover, was to prevent Catherine of Aragon from appealing to Rome against Cranmer's sentence at Dunstable in the marital cause. In practice, it was not the Act in Restraint of Appeals which prevented Catherine's appeal, but the older decrees of Church councils. While it is probably correct to see the years 1529-35 as a revolution, the pace of change was more gradual than Professor Elton has suggested and the instigator of that movement is not Thomas Cromwell alone.<sup>60</sup>

The reign of Edward VI has been treated by many historians in recent years. The general character of the religious policy of those years has been analysed by Professor A.G. Dickens.<sup>61</sup> In an important re-assessment of the policies

---

<sup>60</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII (London, 1968).

<sup>61</sup> A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (London, 1964).



of Protector Somerset, however, Dr M.L. Bush rightly exploded the myth of Somerset's 'liberality'. Dr Bush showed that during the years of his ascendancy Somerset made great use of royal proclamations.<sup>62</sup> Dr Dale Hoak, however, has shown that Dr Bush failed to take full account of the importance of the privy council. Dr Hoak has argued that Somerset was eventually overthrown because he effectively dispensed with conciliar government.<sup>63</sup> Somerset also fell because he could no longer finance the policies which he had initiated. Northumberland re-established conciliar government to solve the financial crisis precipitated by Somerset.<sup>64</sup> Northumberland attempted to justify his policy in raising as much money as possible from the English church by claiming that he wished 'To have His Majesty out of debt'. Such studies are primarily rooted in administrative history. It is clear that Somerset's main principle behind his religious policy is the desire to preserve unity.<sup>65</sup> Northumberland used religion in a similar way. Dr Hoak has argued that Northumberland wished to provide a stable government; the main purpose of government was to execute financial policy.<sup>66</sup>

Important studies of English sees now exist for the Reformation period itself. Mr D.H. Pill has studied

---

<sup>62</sup> M.L. Bush, The Government Policy of Protector Somerset (London, 1975).

<sup>63</sup> D.E. Hoak, The King's Council in the reign of Edward VI (Cambridge, 1976).

<sup>64</sup> D.E. Hoak, 'Rehabilitating the Duke of Northumberland: Politics and Political Control, 1549-53' in The Mid Tudor Polity c. 1540-1560, ed. by J. Loach and R. Tittler (London, 1980), pp. 29-51.

<sup>65</sup> Hoak, op. cit., pp. 174-5.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Hoak, art. cit., pp. 50-1.

the administration of Veysey at Exeter. Mr Pill maintained that the great changes brought about by the Reformation had little effect on the administration of the see. Yet, Mr Pill has clearly underestimated the impact of the royal supremacy in the English church. He has claimed that the only important interruption in the patterns of administration occurred during the rebellion of 1549.<sup>67</sup>

At Ely, Dr Heal has found that Thomas Goodrich was a regular resident in or near his see for much of the 1530s and 1540s. His views on most theological matters seem to have coincided with those of Cranmer and Ridley. He was, however, a politique.<sup>68</sup> Dr Heal has also studied the educational qualifications of clerks promoted to benefices in Ely diocese. In the decade 1516-26, the proportion of graduate clergy in that see fell from 53% of all appointments to 48% in the period 1536-56. Dr Heal has shown that this proportion is higher than in most dioceses. At Winchester between 1532 and 1554, only 25.4% of those instituted to livings were graduates.<sup>69</sup> Dr Oxley has made a similar study for the county of Essex. In the decade 1520-9, the proportion of graduates appointed to benefices was 29%. In the period 1530-9, the figure was

<sup>67</sup> D.H. Pill, 'The administration of the diocese of Exeter under Bishop Veysey' in Transactions of the Devon Association, XCVIII, (1966), pp. 262-78.

<sup>68</sup> F. Heal, The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period: C.A. 1515-1600 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1972), pp. 14-19.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

27%. For the period 1540-9, the proportion was only 17% and this dropped to 7% during the years 1550-9.<sup>70</sup>

In a study of the diocese of Lincoln, Dr Margaret Bowker has provided an important analysis of that see during the episcopate of John Longland. Dr Bowker found that there was little to substantiate the complaints of the Commons about delays in the grant of probate. Using a sample of wills for the archdeaconries of Buckingham and Lincolnshire in 1520-3 and 1530, Dr Bowker has shown that the majority of wills were proved within three months of being drawn up. Such prompt despatch of business was also normal in the diocese of Chichester.<sup>71</sup>

Mr F.D. Price has illustrated the impact which a reforming bishop might make within an English diocese. John Hooper developed advanced theological views during a sojourn on the continent. In 1551, Hooper became bishop of Gloucester and bishop of both Gloucester and Worcester in 1552. Embracing reformed doctrine, Hooper professed in his visitation Articles of 1551 that the Church consisted of the congregation of the faithful, not of a 'multitude or company of men, as of bishops, priests and such others'. Hooper was one of the first English bishops to accept the principle that bishops were not mediators of salvation. Hooper used the traditional apparatus of church

---

<sup>70</sup> J.E. Oxley, The Reformation in Essex to the death of Mary (Manchester, 1965), p. 265.

<sup>71</sup> M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation (Cambridge, 1981), p. 52. Cf. Lander, op. cit., p. 86.

courts and ecclesiastical visitations to impose reform on both clergy and laity. In July 1551, for example, the churchwardens of Beekford were ordered to destroy 'le rode loft' there by the following Saturday. At Woolaston, the churchwardens were ordered to learn the Ten Commandments, to buy the Paraphrases of Erasmus and to destroy images in the church. Hooper placed himself as supreme judge in his consistory court, using office cases to punish moral excesses and instance cases to mitigate the effects of the controversy between the two parties. He also examined the clergy in their knowledge of the Creed, the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. Some 311 clergy were examined in all and only 79 were found satisfactory. Although a bishop for only a short time under the Edwardine regime, Hooper blazed a trail as a reformed pastor of the highest order.<sup>72</sup>

Specialized studies have concentrated on the enforcement of the Reformation Settlement in the 1530s. In his work Policy and Police, Professor Elton wrote an important essay on the implementation of the religious settlement in the dioceses of England and Wales. It was not until 1535 that Thomas Cromwell was able to turn his attention to this problem.<sup>73</sup> It was through the creation of the Vice-Gerency that Cromwell strove to exercise powers of supremacy as

---

<sup>72</sup>F.D. Price, 'Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper 1551-3' in Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society for 1938, vol. 60, pp. 51-151; J. Gairdner, 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester' in English Historical Review, XIX(1904), pp. 98-121.

<sup>73</sup>G.R. Elton, Policy and Police(Cambridge, 1972), pp. 217-62.

the King's deputy. Dr Margaret Bowker has shown convincingly that it was Longland's protests against the archbishop's metropolitical visitation which led to the government's creation of the office of Vicar General.<sup>74</sup> Professor Dickens has emphasised that such an office gave Cromwell precedence over the whole episcopate.<sup>75</sup> The effects of that important office have been debated. Professor Lehmborg argued that the threat posed by the Vice-Gerency was potential, rather than actual.<sup>76</sup> Professor Elton has maintained that the threat was actual, rather than potential.<sup>77</sup> Dr Kitching has examined Cromwell's powers of probate jurisdiction.<sup>78</sup> Further channels for the enforcement of Reformation have been studied. Professor Lehmborg has studied the parliaments and convocations of clergy for the years 1529-47. Concerning convocation, Professor Lehmborg has shown that by 1534 it had ceased to play a significant

---

<sup>74</sup>M. Bowker, 'The Supremacy and the Episcopate: the Struggle for Control, 1534-40' in The Historical Journal, vol. XVIII. 2 (1975), pp. 227-43.

<sup>75</sup>A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (London, 1964), p. 120.

<sup>76</sup>S.E. Lehmborg, 'Supremacy and Vicegerency: A Re-examination' in English Historical Review, vol. CCCXIX (April, 1966), pp. 225-35.

<sup>77</sup>G.R. Elton, Policy and Police (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 247-8.

<sup>78</sup>G.J. Kitching, 'The Probate Jurisdiction of Thomas Cromwell as Vicegerent' in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. XLVI no. 113 (May, 1973), pp. 102-6.

role in the determination of national ecclesiastical policy.<sup>79</sup>  
 Dr G.I.O. Duncan has made a thorough study of the Court of  
 Delegates. This court replaced the papal court as the  
 final court of appeal.<sup>80</sup> Unfortunately, few records for  
 the early sixteenth century have survived.

A growing number of local studies show how the  
 powers of the bishops themselves were used to enforce change  
 in the dioceses of England and Wales. Much depended on the  
 attitude of each bishop to the King as supreme head. At  
 Chichester, Dr Lander has shown that Sherborne opposed the  
 royal supremacy. He gave way to accept the supremacy in late  
 1533 or early 1534. He thereafter complied with the new  
 order, but did so grudgingly.<sup>81</sup> At Ely, Goodrich's views  
 on most theological matters seem to have coincided with  
 those of Cranmer and Ridley. Goodrich himself was a  
 theologian, but Dr Felicity Heal has shown that Goodrich  
 accepted the royal supremacy because he was a politiquer.<sup>82</sup>  
 At Lincoln, Longland took some time in adjusting to the  
 supremacy. He swore all the oaths demanded of him, but  
 he seems to have preached only once on the supremacy itself.

---

<sup>79</sup> S.E. Lehmberg, The Reformation Parliament (Cambridge, 1970).  
 Cf. S.E. Lehmberg, The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII 1536-1547 (Cambridge, 1977).

<sup>80</sup> G.I.O. Duncan, The High Court of Delegates (Cambridge, 1971).

<sup>81</sup> S.J. Lander, The Diocese of Chichester, 1508-1558: Episcopal Reform under Robert Sherburne and its Aftermath (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1974), pp. 18-21.

<sup>82</sup> F. Heal, The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period: C.A. 1515-1600 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1972), pp. 14-15.

In that sermon of 1538, he appealed to the text of Romans 13 and maintained that all bishops and Emperors possessed their respective authority from the supreme authority of Christ. It was clear, therefore, that bishops possessed specific powers from Christ. Longland could acknowledge that the King was 'caput anglicane ecclesie sub Christo' as long as the King did not intrude into his, Longland's, jurisdiction. Since Longland was a theologian, his exegesis of the crucial Pauline passage from Romans 13 is highly significant.<sup>83</sup>

The enforcement of Reformation in the localities varied from diocese to diocese. At Ely, Goodrich was careful to obey Cromwell's instructions. In June 1535, he circulated a Latin letter to all the clergy saying that the authority of the bishop of Rome was now extinct. Once the initial moves to enforce the Henrician settlement were accomplished, most of the routine work devolved upon diocesan officials. William Meye, vicar general and official principal, did much to supervise the despatch of royal mandates throughout the diocese. Visitation articles and injunctions during Goodrich's episcopate were framed with an eye to the government's religious policy. No record of

---

<sup>83</sup> M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: The diocese of Lincoln under John Longland 1521-1547 (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 65-78. For the views of Nykke, Clerk and Tunstal, cf. J.J. Scarisbrick, The Conservative Episcopate in England 1529-1535 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1955), pp. 68-9, 74-6, 78-9, 83, and 278-314. For the views of Warham, cf. M.J. Kelly, Canterbury Jurisdiction and Influence during the episcopate of William Warham, 1503-1532 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1963), pp. 250-75.

Goodrich's own preaching and teaching survives. He certainly encouraged preachers to preach on the royal supremacy. Existing records show that Goodrich was a man who promoted reform by injunction and decree.<sup>84</sup> In Lancashire, however, Dr Haigh has found that the picture is very different. Enforcement of Reformation under Henry VIII was slight. In 1541, the bishop of Chester warned the King that his episcopal powers were inadequate to enforce reform. The administrative structures of the local church were actually used to impede reforming measures. In a rural-decanal synod at Dalton, John Dakyn vicar general of Richmond spoke against the Act of Supremacy. The laity were ready to cling to conservative views. At Kendal, 300 parishoners threatened to drown their curate unless he declared the Pope to be head of the Church. Under Edward VI, the position was little better. The royal visitation of 1547 probably achieved little and it was clear by 1550 that conventional methods of supervising religious life in Lancashire were inadequate. Little is known of the enforcement of Reformation at this time and Dr Haigh contends that this is significant. Existing evidence shows that resistance continued. The statute of 1550 ordering old service books to be delivered to the civil authorities and thence to the bishop for destruction was widely ignored.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup>F. Heal, The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period: C.A. 1515-1600(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1972), pp. 68, 70, 75-7, 80-4 and 87.

<sup>85</sup>C. Haigh, Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 102, 110, 113. 139-40 and 143.



Local studies have also given some indication of the way in which Cranmer used his powers to enforce reform.

Dr Clark has shown that Cranmer and Cromwell had established themselves in a dominant position in the Kentish church by 1535. John Hilsey became bishop of Rochester in 1535. In 1534, the archdeacon of Canterbury surrendered his offices to the archbishop. Cranmer's brother, Edmund Cranmer, became the new archdeacon.<sup>86</sup> Dr Susan Brigden has shown that the government used Cranmer's metropolitanical visitation of 1534 and 1535 to force corporate institutions and the parochial clergy to subscribe to the royal supremacy.<sup>87</sup>

Dr Bowker found that the same was true of Cranmer's visitation within the diocese of Lincoln.<sup>88</sup> Such studies give tantalizing glimpses of the way in which the government used Cranmer's powers as metropolitan and diocesan during the twenty years of his archiepiscopate. It is within Thomas Cranmer's Register, however, that full details concerning his pontificate are to be found.

#### Thomas Cranmer's Register

Thomas Cranmer's Register itself is a massive

---

<sup>86</sup> P. Clark, English provincial society from the Reformation to the Revolution: religion, politics and society in Kent. 1500-1640 (Hassocks, 1977), p. 36.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. S.E. Brigden, The Early Reformation in London. 1520-47: the conflict in the parishes (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1979), pp. 136-9. Cf. J.E. Oxley, The Reformation in Essex to the death of Mary (Manchester, 1965), pp. 83-4.

<sup>88</sup> M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 72-8.

manuscript codex in the library of Lambeth Palace. The compilation is made on parchment and Dr Smith has shown that it measures  $16\frac{1}{2}$ " x 13". The quires are too tightly bound for accurate collation; there is a contemporary arabic foliation. Dr Smith has shown that this is to be represented as: 1-75, 78-276, 278-338, 338[A], 339-405, 405[A], 406-21, 421[A], 422-31, 431[A], 432, 433, 433[A], 434, 435[436, 437].<sup>89</sup> The hands in which the manuscript was compiled are examples of sixteenth century Court hand. The arrangement of the document is thematic and there are ten main subdivisions. These sections, each arranged chronologically, are reserved for papal bulls, convocation writs, diverse littere, heresy trials, sede vacante acta, visitation acta, acta in the nullification of the marriage between Henry VIII and Anne of Cleves, confirmations of episcopal elections, institutions and collations, the purgation of clerici convicti. Dr Smith has recently emphasised that such an arrangement is characteristic of documents of this sort at the time.<sup>90</sup>

Two registrars supervised the compilation of the document during Thomas Cranmer's archiepiscopate. Until 1538, the principal registrar was William Pottkyn.<sup>91</sup> In

---

<sup>89</sup> Lambeth Palace Library, Thomas Cranmer's Register, no class mark; cf. D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales (London, 1981), p. 17.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. ibid., pp. ix-x. A typescript handlist analysing the contents of the Register is kept at Lambeth.

<sup>91</sup> Cf., for example, Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, martyr, 1556, edited for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge, 1846), p. 249.

1538, Anthony Huse was appointed to the post.<sup>92</sup> The standard of registration is difficult to determine. The records of institutions and collations within the diocese are reasonably complete.<sup>93</sup> Yet, the commissions and letters in the 1530s are sadly incomplete. The existing records, moreover, are in some chronological confusion. Documents were registered on loose quires which were later bound to form the present Register. As Dr Smith has emphasised, it was the rule for the bulk of the material to be recorded from drafts or from a rough book.<sup>94</sup> The evidence of Thomas Cranmer's Register fully supports such a conclusion, although no trace of such rough books now survives at Lambeth. The Register is not primarily a precedent book. Within the diverse littere, for example, there are several copies of licences and dispensations.<sup>95</sup> In common with other Registers, the document was not bound during the archbishop's lifetime. Anthony Huse's will, proved in October 1560, left money for the binding of that manuscript:

I bequeath to John Insente xx<sup>li</sup> in monney...  
willinge hym to binde upp in due forme the  
regester of the late Archebisshopp Cranmere...<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library, Register T2, fols 96v.-7.

<sup>93</sup> Lambeth Palace Library, Thomas Cranmer's Register, fols 339-426v.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Smith, op. cit., p. xi.

<sup>95</sup> Cf., for example, Thomas Cranmer's Register, fol. 15-v.

<sup>96</sup> Public Record Office, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 52 Mellershe. I am grateful to Miss Catherine Longley and Dr David Smith for providing me with a transcript of Huse's will.

Presumably, the Register was bound soon after the will was proved. The binding is stamped leather on wooden boards, but the document has now been re-spined.

#### History of Use

Since the archbishop's death in 1556, many scholars have consulted the text of the Register. In 1694, John Strype published the first biography of the English archbishop.<sup>97</sup> He made very extensive use of the material contained within the Register. In an appendix to his work, Strype published four documents from the Register. These are Thomas Cranmer's protestation at his consecration, his oath taken at his consecration, his request for a suffragan see at Dover and his commission to the newly appointed bishop.<sup>98</sup> By far the most important collection of material to be transcribed from the Register appears in Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae by David Wilkins.<sup>99</sup> He printed forty four extracts from the Register. He was mainly concerned with convocation and the activities of the King as supreme head. Gibson used the Register to collect precedents for his compilation on ecclesiastical law entitled Codex juris ecclesiastici Anglicani.<sup>100</sup> In the

---

<sup>97</sup> J. Strype, Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer, 3 vols, published for The Ecclesiastical History Society (Oxford, 1848-54)

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., I, pp. 329-31 and 396-9.

<sup>99</sup> D. Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, 4 vols (London, 1737)

<sup>100</sup> E. Gibson, Codex juris ecclesiastici Anglicani, 2 vols (Oxford, 1761)

eighteenth century, Andrew Ducarel compiled a three volume manuscript index to the Register. This index survives among a series of 67 manuscript indexes for the Canterbury Registers from John Pecham to Thomas Herring.<sup>101</sup> The work has a highly selective subject index. It is probably Ducarel and his assistants who have added marginal headings to parts of the Register.<sup>102</sup> In the nineteenth century, several authors used the document in the compilation of historical works. Stubbs used the records of the consecrations of bishops to compile his Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum.<sup>103</sup> The definitive edition of the Works of Thomas Cranmer also included documents from the section of letters and commissions in an appendix and in the collection of the archbishop's personal letters. Fourteen such excerpts were made in this work, but the standard of editing is not exceptional. Cox was content to rely on authorities such as Strype and Wilkins for the text of the material he wished to use.<sup>104</sup> The importance of the Register for the English church was duly recognised by Gee and Hardy when they included in their Documents illustrative of English Church History the text of the royal injunctions of 1536 and 1538.<sup>105</sup> The

---

<sup>101</sup> A.C. Ducarel, Index Locupletissimus Rerum Quae continentur in Registro Thomae Cranmer Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis Ab A: D: 1533 Ad A: D: 1555. The indexes are kept in the Reading Room at Lambeth Palace Library.

<sup>102</sup> Cf., for example, Thomas Cranmer's Register, fols 15-66.

<sup>103</sup> W. Stubbs, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1897).

<sup>104</sup> Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, martyr, 1556, ed. for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge, 1846), pp. 229-570.

<sup>105</sup> H. Gee and W.J. Hardy, Documents illustrative of English Church History (London, 1921), pp. 269-81.

theme of visitation is continued by Kennedy and Frere in their compilation Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the period of the Reformation who published the important set of injunctions which stems from the archbishop's visitation of All Souls College, Oxford, in the 1540s.<sup>106</sup> In the twentieth century, a controversy initiated several centuries earlier concerning the consecration of Barlow was finally extinguished. Cranmer's Register contains no record of the consecration of Barlow. Since Barlow was the chief consecrator of Matthew Parker, it has been held that Anglican orders are invalid. Jenkins finally extinguished the controversy in an important article on the Register in answer to Barnes' book Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders.<sup>107</sup> The Institute of Historical Research in London is in the process of revising Le Neve's Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae.<sup>108</sup> Dr Michael Zell has recently used the records of institutions and collations for an analysis of clerical promotion and

---

<sup>106</sup> W.P.M. Kennedy and W.H. Frere, Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the period of the Reformation, ed. in 3 vols for The Alcuin Club (London, 1910), II, pp. 70-81.

<sup>107</sup> C. Jenkins, 'Bishop Barlow's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's Register: with some new documents' in Journal of Theological Studies, vol. XXIV (October, 1922), pp. 1-31; cf. The Works of John Bramhall, 5 vols (London, 1842-5), III, Preface [unpaginated]; A.S. Barnes, Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders: A Study of the Original Documents (London, 1922). For the wider context of Parker's consecration, see the list of books cited in Registrum Matthei Parker, diocesis Cantuariensis. A.D. 1559-1575, transcribed and edited by E.M. Thompson and W.H. Frere (Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33), vol. I, p. vii n. 2; cf. W.P.M. Kennedy, Archbishop Parker (London, 1908), pp. 289-96.

<sup>108</sup> J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, 12 vols (London, 1962-7); cf. J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae. 1541-1857, vol. 1- (London, 1969-).

patronage.<sup>109</sup> No writer, however, has attempted to study the Register as a complete document. No theologian has attempted to set the archbishop's administration in the context of his reformed theological views.

Analysis of Thomas Cranmer's Register.

Thomas Cranmer's Register may be divided into ten main collections of acta. Each section of material is broadly chronological. The opening section of the archbishop's Register records the papal bulls of provision by which Thomas Cranmer received his appointment to the see of Canterbury. The central document recorded in this section is the bull of papal provision. With the issue of this bull, Cranmer was appointed to the metropolitanical see of Canterbury. The issue of the pallium and the form of the oath of loyalty to the see of Rome are also recorded. The final document is a public instrument recording the archbishop's celebrated protestation which he made at his consecration in March 1533.<sup>110</sup>

The second section of material comprises royal writs for the summons, prorogation and dissolution of convocation. The first writ registered there dates from the

---

<sup>109</sup>M.L. Zell, 'The Personnel of the clergy in Kent, in the Reformation period' in English Historical Review, vol. LXXXIX (July, 1974), pp. 513-33.

<sup>110</sup>Lambeth Palace Library[henceforth cited as L.P.L.], Thomas Cranmer's Register[henceforth cited as C.R.], fols 1-5v. The section of papal bulls is transcribed in the Appendix below; cf. below, pp. 367-81.

year 1539. The final writ dates from August 1553 and was issued in the name of Queen Mary.<sup>111</sup>

The most important collection of material within the Register is contained within the third section. This collection consists of commissions and mandates issued by the archbishop of Canterbury to his clergy and officials. Letters missive and writs received by the registry are also recorded.<sup>112</sup> One single document records the sede vacante administration of the prior and chapter following the death of William Warham.<sup>113</sup> No preaching licences survive within Thomas Cranmer's Register for the period of his episcopate.<sup>114</sup> Commissions to diocesan and provincial officials, however, are recorded there. Several commissions for the exercise of jurisdiction in vacant sees of the province have been entered in this section of the Register. Writs concerning the summons of convocation have also been recorded here. The royal supremacy over the English church is also illustrated by this section of material. Letters missive from the King to the bishops concerning liturgical and doctrinal reform are registered here. Writs of certiorari from the court of first fruits and tenths also survive. There is also material relating to the royal visitation of 1547. Several commissions and letters have been entered elsewhere in the

---

<sup>111</sup>C.R., fols 9-14.

<sup>112</sup>Ibid., fols 15-66. The section of diverse littere is transcribed in the Appendix; cf. below, pp. 382-516.

<sup>113</sup>C.R., fols 34v.-6v.

<sup>114</sup>Cf. ibid., passim.



Register. Such misplaced material includes a copy of  
of the royal injunctions of 1538.<sup>115</sup>

The following section comprises a collection of  
royal commissions for the trial of heretics. The commissions  
date from 1538 onwards. Not all the resulting acta appear to  
have been included within the Register. The most important  
trials recorded in the manuscript are those of Joan Bocher  
and George van Parris.<sup>116</sup>

The fifth section of material concerns the  
administration of vacant sees within the southern province.<sup>117</sup>  
Miss Churchill has shown that the arrangements concerning  
sede vacante administration varied from diocese to diocese.<sup>118</sup>  
Nevertheless, all vacant sees in the southern province were  
to be administered by the archbishop by virtue of his rights  
as metropolitan. No record of jurisdiction sede vacante  
survives within the archbishop's Register before the  
vacancy in the see of Hereford in 1538. Nevertheless,  
nine institutions are recorded for the vacancy in the see of  
St Asaph in 1535 and 1536.<sup>119</sup> The entries for each vacancy  
are by no means complete. The kernel of such records is  
to be found in the institutions to benefices.

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., fols 215v.-16v.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., fols 67-79.

<sup>117</sup> C.R., fols 89-137v.

<sup>118</sup> I.J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration [henceforth cited  
as Administration]. 2 vols (London, 1933), I, pp. 161-240  
and II, pp. 41-118.

<sup>119</sup> C.R., fol. 358-v.

The largest single collection of records within the Register is the section devoted to the confirmation of episcopal elections. It was the statute of 1534 which modified the system of appointments to diocesan sees.<sup>120</sup> By virtue of the act, bulls of provision were no longer to be sought from Rome. Chapters were to continue to elect the man nominated by the King in letters missive. As metropolitan, the archbishop was henceforth to confirm the election. Following confirmation, mandates for consecration and enthronement were to be issued. During the reign of Edward VI, such administrative machinery was swept away by statute. Henceforth, bishops were to receive their appointment by the simple issue of letters patent. The archbishop was to ensure that such bishops received consecration and that a mandate for enthronement was despatched to the archdeacon of Canterbury.<sup>121</sup> The records of all such episcopal appointments are recorded in the Register.<sup>122</sup> The confirmation of Goodrich's election to Ely in 1534 has been recorded outside the main deposit of such documents.<sup>123</sup>

The penultimate section of material within the manuscript is the record of institutions and collations

---

<sup>120</sup> Statutes of the Realm, compiled by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins, J. Raithby et al., 11 vols [henceforth cited as Stat. Realm] (London, 1810-28), III, pp. 462-4.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., IV, i, pp. 3-4.

<sup>122</sup> C.R., fols 149-215, 217v.-336.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., fols 81-7v.

within the diocese of Canterbury during the pontificate of Thomas Cranmer. Dr Smith has shown that such records are the historic kernel of all episcopal Registers.<sup>124</sup> It was vital for a bishop to possess accurate information concerning the clergy of his diocese. For the years of Cranmer's episcopate, 594 collations and institutions are recorded in the Register.<sup>125</sup>

Three small collections of material complete the records to be found within the Register. Within the section of diverse littere, an unusually full record of the visitation of All Souls College, Oxford, in 1541 has been compiled.<sup>126</sup> The only other visitation material to be found within the Register concerns the protest of Richard Nykke, bishop of Norwich, at the archbishop's metropolitanical visitation in 1534.<sup>127</sup> In 1540, a joint session of the convocations of Canterbury and York met to decide the King's marital cause against Anne of Cleves. The acta are carefully recorded in the Register.<sup>128</sup> Similar documents occur in Lee's Register at York.<sup>129</sup> Finally, the purgation of clerici convicti may be found in Cranmer's Register.<sup>130</sup> No ordinations are preserved there, although such records certainly

---

<sup>124</sup> D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales (London, 1981), p. ix.

<sup>125</sup> C.R., fols 339-426v.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., fols 40-6

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., fols 137v.-40; cf. below, pp. 517-34.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., fols 141-6v.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Smith, op. cit., p. 249.

<sup>130</sup> C.R., fols 427-33.

occur in the Register of William Warham.<sup>131</sup>

Other sources used

Whilst it is clear that Thomas Cranmer's Register forms an important example of such a document, further Registers shed important light upon current methods of registration and on Cranmer's administration in diocese and province. At Ely, the Register of Thomas Goodrich is in some disarray for it survives in two volumes.<sup>132</sup> The acts for the episcopate of Thomas Goodrich are registered without divisions for each category of act. Institutions, therefore, are recorded haphazardly throughout both volumes. There are also copies of earlier documents such as foundation deeds of chantries<sup>133</sup> and compositions between rectors and vicars.<sup>134</sup> The reality of the royal supremacy within the English church is also evident. Following circular letters to the bishops in June 1535 concerning the enforcement of the supremacy,<sup>135</sup> Goodrich's instructions to the clergy of the diocese are carefully recorded.<sup>136</sup>

<sup>131</sup>Smith, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

<sup>132</sup>University Library of Cambridge[henceforth cited as U.L.C.], Ely Diocesan Records[henceforth cited as E.D.R.] G/1/7, fols 88-190v. and G/1/8, fols 1-22v. For possible explanations concerning the division in Goodrich's Register, cf. F. Heal, The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period: C.A. 1515-1600(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1972), pp. 329-30.

<sup>133</sup>Cf., for example, G/1/7, fols 128-30 and 142-3.

<sup>134</sup>Cf. ibid., fols 189v.-90v.

<sup>135</sup>Cf. G.R. Elton, Policy and Police(Cambridge, 1972), pp. 231-2.

<sup>136</sup>Cf. G/1/7, fol. 125.

In 1550, the bishop of Ely received instructions from the privy council to remove altars from all parish churches and to replace them with tables. The clerics of each deanery were ordered to meet to receive instructions.<sup>137</sup>

The Register also furnishes important illustrations of the role of Thomas Cranmer as metropolitan of the province. There are records of the issue of writs for convocation.<sup>138</sup> The archbishop's despatch of the relaxation of the general inhibition for the royal visitation of 1547 is recorded.<sup>139</sup> The government's demands for the removal of images is also recorded. These instructions were despatched by the archbishop as metropolitan of the province.<sup>140</sup> Four orders are also noted for the holding of general processions in the diocese of Ely for the years 1542, 1543, 1544 and 1545. Two contain archiepiscopal mandates which are not recorded in Thomas Cranmer's Register and which are unpublished. In 1542, processions were ordered to be held for war against the Turks.<sup>141</sup> In 1545, the archbishop despatched orders from the King that from henceforth the English Litany was to be used on Sundays and holy days. The instructions were first sent to the bishop of London as dean of the province.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup>G/1/8, fol. 18-v.

<sup>138</sup>Cf. G/1/7, fols 169v.-70v. and 175v.

<sup>139</sup>Ibid., fol. 181-v.

<sup>140</sup>Ibid., fol. 185-v.; of. G.R., fol. 32-v.

<sup>141</sup>G/1/7, fol. 148-v.

<sup>142</sup>Ibid., fol. 176-v.

It was the bishop of London who then despatched them to the suffragans of the province. Thomas Goodrich's Register is a full account of his administration and sheds important light upon the administration of Thomas Cranmer as metropolitan.

At York, the Registers of Edward Lee and Nicholas Heath cover the years 1531-54.<sup>143</sup> Purvis has shown that Lee's Register is conventional in format, whereas Holgate's is an inadequate record of episcopal administration.<sup>144</sup> Lee's Register begins, like that of Thomas Cranmer, with papal bulls of provision.<sup>145</sup> The following four sections contain institutions to benefices and other business in the archdeaconries of York,<sup>146</sup> the East Riding,<sup>147</sup> Cleveland,<sup>148</sup> and Nottingham.<sup>149</sup> The next section is a collection of records concerning the archbishop's collations.<sup>150</sup> A postscript to this collection is a record of business in Howdenshire and Allertonshire.<sup>151</sup> The most important section, like that within Cranmer's Register, is the collection

---

<sup>143</sup>Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York[henceforth cited as B.I.], Registers 28 and 29.

<sup>144</sup>J.S. Purvis, 'The Registers of Archbishops Lee and Holgate' in The Journal of Ecclesiastical History[henceforth cited as J.E.H.], vol. 13(October, 1962), pp. 186-94.

<sup>145</sup>B.I., Register 28, fol. 1.

<sup>146</sup>Ibid., fols 2-21v.

<sup>147</sup>Ibid., fols 22-37v.

<sup>148</sup>Ibid., fols 38-45v.

<sup>149</sup>Ibid., fols 46-53v.

<sup>150</sup>Ibid., fols 54-77v.

<sup>151</sup>Ibid., fols 78-9v.

of diverse littere.<sup>152</sup> Following this section of material, there is a record of probate acta.<sup>153</sup> There is also a collection of quires devoted to records of ordinations.<sup>154</sup> Each section is chronological in arrangement.

The section of letters and commissions is very full. It contains important material relating to the implementation of the royal supremacy within the English church. In June 1534, it is noted that a certificate was despatched to the King recording that the convocation of York agreed unanimously to the proposition 'Quod Romanus episcopus non habet maiorem aliquam jurisdictionem collatam sibi a Deo in sacra Scriptura in hoc regno Anglie quam alius quivis externus episcopus'. As Dr Hughes commented, the fort was betrayed.<sup>155</sup> There are records of heresy trials concerning Lambert Sparrow alias Hooke, Dutchman,<sup>156</sup> Giles Vanbeller, Dutchman,<sup>157</sup> Richard Browne, vicar of North Cave,<sup>158</sup> and Denise Johnson.<sup>159</sup> Whilst it is not to be expected that Lee's Register contains material which directly relates to the episcopal administration of Thomas Cranmer

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., fols 80-157v.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., fols 158-83v.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., fols 184-201v.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., fol. 88; cf. P. Hughes, The Reformation in England, 3 vols (London, 1950-54), vol. I, frontispiece.

<sup>156</sup> B.I., Register 28, fols 50-v. and 82v.-3.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., fols 89v.-91.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., fols 99v.-100.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., fol. 141v.

of diverse littere.<sup>152</sup> Following this section of material, there is a record of probate acta.<sup>153</sup> There is also a collection of quires devoted to records of ordinations.<sup>154</sup> Each section is chronological in arrangement.

The section of letters and commissions is very full. It contains important material relating to the implementation of the royal supremacy within the English church. In June 1534, it is noted that a certificate was despatched to the King recording that the convocation of York agreed unanimously to the proposition 'Quod Romanus episcopus non habet maiorem aliquam jurisdictionem collatam sibi a Deo in sacra Scriptura in hoc regno Anglie quam alius quivis externus episcopus'. As Dr Hughes commented, the fort was betrayed.<sup>155</sup> There are records of heresy trials concerning Lambert Sparrow alias Hooke, Dutchman,<sup>156</sup> Giles Vanbeller, Dutchman,<sup>157</sup> Richard Browne, vicar of North Cave,<sup>158</sup> and Denise Johnson.<sup>159</sup> Whilst it is not to be expected that Lee's Register contains material which directly relates to the episcopal administration of Thomas Cranmer

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., fols 80-157v.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., fols 158-83v.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., fols 184-201v.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., fol. 88; cf. P. Hughes, The Reformation in England, 3 vols (London, 1950-54), vol. I, frontispiece.

<sup>156</sup> B.I., Register 28, fols 50-v. and 82v.-3.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., fols 89v.-91.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., fols 99v.-100.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., fol. 141v.



in the southern province, there are important parallels between the two documents. Like Cranmer's Register, the Register of Edward Lee contains a record of the nullification of the marriage of Henry VIII to Anne of Cleves.<sup>160</sup> There is also a record of the grant of preaching licences by archbishop Lee 'ad requisitionem domini Cant' archiepiscopi'.<sup>161</sup>

Holgate's Register is an inferior production when compared to its predecessor. There are no longer separate divisions for the acta in each archdeaconry. The Register may be divided into five sections. The opening section deals with the convocation of the northern province.<sup>162</sup> The next collection of quires contains general acta relating to the archbishop's administration for all archdeaconries.<sup>163</sup> Convocation business follows this<sup>164</sup> and the final section is devoted to testamentary acta.<sup>165</sup> The bulk of the probate material in Nicholas Heath's Register, bound together with that of Holgate, properly belongs to Holgate's pontificate.<sup>166</sup>

Dr Smith has shown that at York, there is a subsidiary series of institution act books which date from c. 1545. In the first volume, there is a variety of

---

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., fols 142-50.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., fol. 137v.

<sup>162</sup> B.I., Register 29, fols 12-14v.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid., fols 17-67.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid., fols 69-71.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid., fols 75-109v.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., fols 138-67v.

acta.<sup>167</sup> Initially, such books were contemporary working office books of the vicars general. Certain entries, all of them concerned with institutions and collations, were later copied into the archbishop's Register. At this date, such an act book was subsidiary to the Register and was not intended to replace it. By the time of the pontificates of Young and Grindal, the acta of the archbishop were entered along with those of his vicar general in the institution act book. At this time, the records of institutions and collations in both Register and act book are identical. Following Sandys' appointment to York, the task of recording collations and institutions in the Register was discontinued.<sup>168</sup>

Whilst Thomas Cranmer's Register compares favourably with other Reformation Registers, original documents and records of the archbishop's acta also survive outside those compilations. Little trace of files of loose documents survives at Lambeth. Important material, however, does survive among the class of records entitled Cartae Antiquae et Miscellaneae.<sup>169</sup> Most of the relevant documents concern the archbishop's metropolitical visitation.<sup>170</sup> An original marriage dispensation from the faculty office also survives.<sup>171</sup> Material

<sup>167</sup> Cf. D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales (London, 1981), pp. 252-3.

<sup>168</sup> D.M. Smith, 'The York Institution Act Books: Diocesan Registration in the Sixteenth Century' in Archives, vol. XIII no. 60 (Autumn, 1978), pp. 171-9.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. D.M. Owen, A Catalogue of Lambeth Palace Manuscripts 889 to 901 (Cartae Antiquae et Miscellaneae) (London, 1968).

<sup>170</sup> Cf. ibid., II, 49, 55-6, 63, 65, 78; VI, 53, 71; XI, 56; XII, 56; XIII, 28.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. ibid., VI, 69.

also survives elsewhere in diocesan registries throughout the country. At Canterbury, important documents are preserved in the cartularies of the prior/dean and chapter. There are copies of commissions to officials and of patents granting the next vacancy in such posts to named individuals.<sup>172</sup> Some of the commissions are of great significance. John Hughes' appointment as clerk of the faculties is recorded here.<sup>173</sup> More importantly, the first commission to be issued for the post of commissary of the faculties is registered in the chapter muniments.<sup>174</sup> The appointment of Anthony Huse as the archbishop's registrar is also recorded for the year 1538.<sup>175</sup> Similarly, the commission to William Cooke as master of the prerogative occurs for the year 1547.<sup>176</sup> All such appointments are not recorded in the archbishop's Register. Some licences are also registered in the cartularies for the consecration of diocesan bishops outside Canterbury cathedral.<sup>177</sup> It is at Canterbury that the records of sede vacante jurisdiction following the attainder of Thomas Cranmer for treason in 1553 are to be found. Such records survive in two Registers.<sup>178</sup> Original letters

<sup>172</sup> Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library [henceforth cited as C.C.A.L.], Register T2, fols 5-v., 24v.-5, 30v.-1, 31-v., 53v.-4, 73v.-4, 96v.-7, 99v.-100; Register U, fols 11-v., 50, 76v., 90v., 157-v., 189-v., 226v., 248-v., 249, 250.

<sup>173</sup> Register T2, fols 24v.-5.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., fols 30v.-1; cf. ibid., fols 73v.-4 and Register U, fol. 11-v.

<sup>175</sup> Register T2, fols 96v.-7.

<sup>176</sup> Register U, fol. 157-v.

<sup>177</sup> Register T2, fols 8v., 9, 9-v., 25v.-6, 146v.-7, 165, 169, 176-v.

<sup>178</sup> Register N, fols 1-169v. and Register VI, fols 1, 5-7, 9-13,

also survive. A letter from the archbishop to the dean and chapter of Canterbury survives in Register U.<sup>179</sup> A collection of scrap books entitled Christ Church Letters also preserves an original letter of the archbishop which has not been published.<sup>180</sup> An original dispensation from the faculty office also survives.<sup>181</sup> It is a marriage dispensation for William Grene and Joan Wormeston. The registered copy survives among the records of the faculty office.<sup>182</sup>

At London, important material concerning the archbishop's activity survives among the muniments of the bishop of London. A very important section of John Stokesley's Register concerns the latter's resistance to the archbishop's metropolitocal visitation.<sup>183</sup> A copy of the inhibition for the royal visitation of 1535 is recorded there. This was transmitted throughout the province by the archbishop of Canterbury, but a copy does not survive within the archiepiscopal Register. As dean of the province, the bishop of London was to send copies of the inhibition to the archbishop's suffragans.<sup>184</sup> Further material survives in the Register of

---

16-20, 22-8, 32, 37, 45-9.

<sup>179</sup>Register U, fol. 157v. Cf. Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, martyr, 1556 [henceforth cited as P.S., Cranmer II], ed. for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge, 1846), p. 417.

<sup>180</sup>Christ Church Letters, III, no. 2.

<sup>181</sup>Ibid., no. 273.

<sup>182</sup>D.S. Chambers, Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549 (Oxford, 1966), p. 174.

<sup>183</sup>Guildhall Library, Aldermanbury, London [henceforth cited as G.L.], MS. 9531/11, fols 59-67.

<sup>184</sup>Ibid., fol. 67-v. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 463.

Edmund Bonner before his deprivation in 1550. Throughout the compilation, there are writs for the summons of convocation.<sup>185</sup> A letter from the archbishop is also recorded requesting a general collection to be made for war against the Turks. A draft speech was enclosed with the letter.<sup>186</sup> The archbishop's letters to Bonner concerning the abolition of the ceremonies of candles and palms also survive.<sup>187</sup> A collection of institutions sede vacante for the vacancy in the see in 1550 is likewise recorded there.<sup>188</sup> The acta in the trial and deprivation of Bonner, for which Cranmer was one of the commissioners, are also recorded in the former's Register.<sup>189</sup>

At Lincoln, material survives concerning the archbishop's transmittal of the inhibition for the royal visitation of 1535.<sup>190</sup> Among the archives of the dean and chapter, important documents survive concerning their protest and the protest of the diocesan bishop against the archbishop's own visitation of 1534. The acta contain copies of documents which were issued by the government to the archbishop's commissaries during the latter's visitation. These consist of a royal mandate which forbids resistance to

---

<sup>185</sup>G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fols 1-242v.

<sup>186</sup>Ibid., fols 45v.-6. The archbishop's letter has not previously been published. Material relating to the execution of the archbishop's commands is recorded in ibid., fol. 47.

<sup>187</sup>Ibid., fols 116v.-17. Only the first letter is printed in the collected Works of the archbishop. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 417.

<sup>188</sup>G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fols 175v.-6.

<sup>189</sup>Ibid., fols 218-41v.

<sup>190</sup>Lincoln Archive Office[henceforth cited as L.A.O.], Register 26, fol. 261-v.

the visitation and a royal commission to Richard Gwent which empowers him to receive an oath of supremacy and succession from the clergy.<sup>191</sup> An original appeal against the archbishop's jurisdiction also survives at Lincoln.<sup>192</sup> In the act books of the dean and chapter, documents are preserved concerning the administration of the see following the death of John Longland in 1547.<sup>193</sup>

If copies of the archbishop's acta survive among the records of diocesan bishops, such material also survives in the collections of national libraries and elsewhere. At The British Library, the collections of charters contain an original marriage dispensation,<sup>194</sup> a notification from the archbishops of Canterbury and York to the King of the decision of the two convocations in his marital cause against Anne of Cleves,<sup>195</sup> and an order for the English Litany to be used.<sup>196</sup> A copy of Henry VIII's commission to Cranmer for the exercise of his jurisdiction also survives, as do a sede vacante commission for 1533 and Christopher Lord's protest at his consecration in 1534.<sup>197</sup> From the records of convocation, David Wilkins has preserved two archiepiscopal

---

<sup>191</sup> L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. 2, fols 1-4[first numeration] and 1-13[second numeration].

<sup>192</sup> L.A.O., Dvj/24/4.

<sup>193</sup> Chapter Acts of the Cathedral Church of St Mary of Lincoln A.D. 1520-1559, ed. by R.E.G. Cole (Lincoln Record Society, 12-13, 15, 1915-20), vol. 13, pp. 145-9.

<sup>194</sup> British Library[henceforth cited as B.L.], Sloane Charter XXXII.I.

<sup>195</sup> B.L., Cotton Charter X.13.

<sup>196</sup> B.L., Additional Charter 8056.

<sup>197</sup> B.L., Additional MS. 48022, fols 98-v., 143v.-6 and 165v.-6.

mandates concerning the abolition of holy days in 1537.<sup>198</sup>

In The Public Record Office, the original notification to the King of the provision of Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury survives.<sup>199</sup> Material is also preserved there concerning the protest of the bishop of Lincoln at Thomas Cranmer's metropolitical visitation.<sup>200</sup> At The Bodleian Library, Oxford, an original commission exists for the visitation of the college of Higham Ferrers in 1540.<sup>201</sup> At Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, an original mandate from Lambeth is preserved. It is dated 1534 and is a revocation of all preaching licences.<sup>202</sup> All such original muniments not recorded in the archbishop's Register and copies of acta relating to the archbishop's administration in diocese and province form valuable additions to the records contained within that prelate's Register.

Whilst such archives preserve much material concerning Thomas Cranmer's administrative activities as metropolitan of the province of Canterbury, further archives must also be consulted. Amongst the most important of

<sup>198</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 468-9 and 470-1.

<sup>199</sup> The Public Record Office[henceforth cited as P.R.O.], C. 82. 667; L.P., VI, 417(271i). Cf. L.P.L., C.R., fol. 1-v.

<sup>200</sup> P.R.O., SP 1/85, fols 101-5; L.P., VII, 1044; cf. P.R.O., SP 1/91, fols 7-14; L.P., VIII, 312.

<sup>201</sup> The Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Ch. Lincoln 1378.

<sup>202</sup> Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 106, unpaginated. Cf. M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1912), I, p. 219.

these are the Tudor State Papers. These collections are well calendared for the reign of Henry VIII in Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.<sup>203</sup>

For the 1530s, the papers of Thomas Cromwell are invaluable. These papers were confiscated after the fall of that Tudor minister. His letters have been published by Merriman.<sup>204</sup>

Since the calendars were published, important material in private hands has been deposited within the Department of Manuscripts at The British Library. In the early 1950s, the Library acquired the Yelverton Manuscripts from Brigadier R.H. Anstruther-Gough-Calthorpe and his trustees. The nucleus of the collection consists of the papers of Robert Beale (1541-1601), clerk of the council to Elizabeth I. It was one of the most important archives of Elizabeth's reign to remain in private hands.<sup>205</sup> In this collection, there survives a copy of Thomas Cromwell's Register as Vice-Gerent. These documents are taken from a book belonging to one of Beale's colleagues.<sup>206</sup> It is unclear if Beale copied all the extracts he found. The existing compilation is chronological for it covers the years 1535-40. The Register records the acts of Thomas Cromwell

<sup>203</sup> Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII... [A Calendar], ed. by J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner and R.H. Brodie, 21 vols (London, 1862-1910), vol. I [rev. ed.] (1920), Addenda I vol (1929-32); cf. State Papers... King Henry the Eighth, 11 vols (London, 1830-52).

<sup>204</sup> R.B. Merriman, The Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell, 2 vols (Oxford, 1902).

<sup>205</sup> B. Schofield, 'The Yelverton Manuscripts' in British Museum Quarterly, vol. XIX (1954), pp. 3-9.

<sup>206</sup> B.L., Additional MS. [henceforth cited as Add. MS.], 48022, fols 83-96.



as Vice-Gerent. The contents of the manuscript are of great significance in relation to the jurisdiction of Thomas Cranmer as metropolitan of the province of Canterbury.

Further sources for the study of the implementation of the reformed political settlement in England and Wales are well known. Parliamentary statutes are of great importance for the period of Cromwell's ascendancy.<sup>207</sup> Royal proclamations concerning religion are contained in the collection of Tudor Royal Proclamations.<sup>208</sup> The acts of the privy council are also an important guide to the implementation of the government's religious policies.<sup>209</sup> Dr Hoak, however, has shown that Somerset abandoned conciliar government. He attended to business in his own household and made use of a so-called 'new Council' of men, most of whom were not privy councillors.<sup>210</sup> Northumberland sought to re-establish the conciliar government which Somerset had abandoned.<sup>211</sup>

One further document must be considered. The

---

<sup>207</sup> Statutes of the Realm, compiled in 11 vols by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins, J. Raithby et al. (London, 1810-28), vols III and IV, 1, pp. 1-196.

<sup>208</sup> Tudor Royal Proclamations, ed. by P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin, 3 vols (New Haven, 1964-69).

<sup>209</sup> Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England 10 Richard II 1386 - 33 Henry VIII 1542, ed. in 7 vols by Sir H. Nicholas (London, 1834-7); Acts of the Privy Council of England A.D. 1542 - 1631, New Series, 46 vols (London, 1890-1964).

<sup>210</sup> D. Hoak, The King's Council in the reign of Edward VI (Cambridge, 1976).

<sup>211</sup> D. Hoak, 'Rehabilitating the Duke of Northumberland: Politics and Political Control 1549-53' in The Mid-Tudor Polity, ed. by J. Loach and R. Tittler (London, 1980), pp. 29-51.

Yelverton Manuscripts have yielded a copy of the revised code of canon law drawn up under Henry VIII.<sup>212</sup> The compilation is entitled 'Ecclesiastical lawes devised in Kynge Henry the VIII<sup>th</sup> [his] dayes'.<sup>213</sup> As early as 1532, the need was felt for a new collection of canons. Dr F.D. Logan has dated the manuscript to the period 1535-39.<sup>214</sup> The collection is prefaced by a letter which shows that papal canon law was to be abolished:

Leges omnes, decreta, atque instituta que  
ab authore episcopo Romano profecta sunt  
prorsus abroganda esse censuimus...<sup>215</sup>

There are also important sermons and manuscripts from the pen of the archbishop himself which shed considerable light upon the theological context of his administrative acta. Over three hundred letters of the archbishop are known to survive. These have been printed in the collected edition of the archbishop's Works.<sup>216</sup> The letters are most numerous for the period 1533-40 and many are concerned with Cranmer's administration of the diocese of Canterbury. In contrast, hardly any sermons have survived. It is clear that Cranmer placed great stress on preaching in person in his diocese.<sup>217</sup> The speech which Cranmer delivered at the consecration of Edward VI contains important material relating to his concept of royal supremacy.<sup>218</sup> His rejection

<sup>212</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48040, fols 13-102v.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid., fol. 13.

<sup>214</sup> F.D. Logan, 'The Henrician Canons' in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XLVII(1974), pp. 99-103.

<sup>215</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48040, fols 15v.-16.

<sup>216</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 229-459.

<sup>217</sup> Cr. ibid., p. 326.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., pp. 126-7.

of papal canon law appears forcefully in his Answers to the rebels of Devon in 1549.<sup>219</sup> A Sermon concerning the time of rebellion seems to have been drawn up in Latin by Peter Martyr from Notes provided by Cranmer, who later drew up a sermon in English. The manuscript of the English sermon contains corrections in Cranmer's hand.<sup>220</sup> The sermon contains evidence concerning Cranmer's views on royal supremacy during the reign of Edward VI. A most important piece of evidence for his views on royal supremacy and his concept of ministry consists of Answers made to certain questions on the sacraments.<sup>221</sup> Answers to the same set of questions by Thomas Thirlby as bishop elect of Westminster seem to fix the date of the manuscript as 1540.<sup>222</sup>

More material survives in manuscript form concerning the archbishop's views at Lambeth Palace Library and in The British Library. Lambeth Palace Manuscript 1107 forms crucial primary source material for any study of the evolution of the archbishop's theological views.<sup>223</sup> The manuscript is a careful study of Roman canon law. Its method of compilation is of particular interest. Within the manuscript, extracts from the canon law have been made with which the

---

<sup>219</sup> Ibid., pp. 163-87.

<sup>220</sup> Cf. ibid., pp. 188-9 and 190-202.

<sup>221</sup> Ibid., pp. 115-17.

<sup>222</sup> Ibid., p. 115 n. 1.

<sup>223</sup> L.P.L., MS. 1107, fols 1-75.

compiler disagrees. In the margin of the work, the Latin word 'error' has been inserted. A later hand has erased this word and substituted the substance of the archbishop's complaint. The title of the volume is Bishop Cranmer's Collections of the Lawe. The range of topics treated in the manuscript is very wide. The most important topic so treated is that of royal supremacy within the Church. Themes such as monasticism, the clergy, church courts and fasting are also discussed. It is clear that the manuscript is early in date. External evidence strongly suggests that the compilation was complete in 1535 for the archbishop made use of material in the manuscript in his sermons.<sup>224</sup> This source has never been used by any scholar engaged in Cranmer Studies.

The massive Commonplace Books in The British Library are more widely known.<sup>225</sup> The date of their compilation presents some difficulties, but they are not earlier than the mid 1530s.<sup>226</sup> The history of these volumes is well known, for they were recovered by Matthew Parker from a member of the Canterbury chapter who tried to deny that he possessed them.<sup>227</sup> The contents of the manuscripts are mainly related to the archbishop's sacramental theology. The

---

<sup>224</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 326.

<sup>225</sup>B.L., MSS Royal 7B XI and XII.

<sup>226</sup>Sir G.F. Warner and J.P. Gilson, Catalogue of Western MSS in the Old Royal and King's Collections, 4 vols (London, 1921), vol. I, pp. 172-3.

<sup>227</sup>Cf. A.J. Mason, Thomas Cranmer (London, 1898), pp. 84-5. The contents of the manuscripts are listed in ibid., pp. 86-8.

section De Ordinibus Ecclesiasticis, however, contains crucial material concerning Thomas Cranmer's concept of ministry within the Church.<sup>228</sup> Such material forms an important addition to the evidence contained in the revised Ordinal.<sup>229</sup> Cranmer's views on royal supremacy within the English church receive important treatment in another section of the manuscript entitled De Obediencia erga magistratus.<sup>230</sup> Such material supplements the notes within the legal Commonplace Book, Lambeth Palace Manuscript 1107, and makes possible an evaluation of Thomas Cranmer's concept of royal supremacy.

The final manuscript source to shed important light upon the archbishop's administration is the compilation Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.<sup>231</sup> The manuscript was formerly in the possession of John Foxe and consists of 267 folios. It was published by Cardwell in a new edition in 1850.<sup>232</sup> It is clear that Matthew Parker also possessed a manuscript of the work. In Cranmer's manuscript, Foxe has added a table of contents from Parker's manuscript: 'Ordo titulorum in codice d. Matthei Cant'.<sup>233</sup> The contents of Parker's manuscript are identical to the published copy of

<sup>228</sup> B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fols 178-98; cf. ibid., fols 198v.-206.

<sup>229</sup> The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552...set forth by authority in the reign of King Edward VI [henceforth cited as P.S., Liturgies], ed. for The Parker Society by J. Ketley (Cambridge, 1844), pp. 159-86 and 329-54.

<sup>230</sup> B.L., MS. Royal 7B XII, fols 316-19v.

<sup>231</sup> B.L., Harleian MS. [henceforth cited as Harl. MS.] 426.

<sup>232</sup> The Reformation of The Ecclesiastical Laws as attempted in the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth, a new edition by E. Cardwell (Oxford, 1850)

<sup>233</sup> Cf. B.L., Harl. MS. 426, fols 1-2.

the code which was issued in 1571.<sup>234</sup> No trace of Parker's manuscript now survives. Several sections of the completed code are lacking in Cranmer's manuscript. These consist of the sections De Renunciacione, De Permutatione beneficiorum, De purgatione, De poenis ecclesiasticis, De suspensione, De fructuum deductione, De deprivatione and De excommunicatione.<sup>215</sup>

Thomas Cranmer's manuscript reflects his mature views concerning the administration of the English church.<sup>236</sup> It deals with the true doctrine upon which the Church is to be founded. Rules are stipulated concerning the appointment of clergy, the conduct of services and of church courts. The manuscript itself is not a fair copy. It is, however, a draft which has been corrected by Cranmer and others. It may fairly be taken as a true representation of Cranmer's mature views.<sup>237</sup>

Three early biographies of Thomas Cranmer contain important material relating to the archbishop. John Strype's biography is of great importance,<sup>238</sup> but its usefulness is limited by the fact that Strype understood little about ecclesiastical administration. In the opening section of the Register, a papal dispensation releases the archbishop

<sup>234</sup> Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, edited by John Foxe (London, 1571); a copy exists in The University Library of Cambridge, classmark Q\*.5.64.

<sup>235</sup> Cf. R.L.E., pp. 70-80 and 156-77; the Formula reconciliationis in the title De excommunicatione does exist in the manuscript.

<sup>236</sup> Cf. ibid., pp. vi-x.

<sup>237</sup> Cf. ibid., p. x.

<sup>238</sup> J. Strype, Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer, 3 vols, published for The Ecclesiastical History Society (Oxford, 1848-54).

elect from all ecclesiastical censures and penalties.<sup>239</sup>

Strype believed that this may be an indication that Cranmer was tainted with Lutheranism.<sup>240</sup> Warham's Register, however,

shows that it was a customary document issued as part of the process of papal provision.<sup>241</sup> Two contemporary

biographies of the archbishop provide useful information concerning Cranmer's life and work. The Lyfe and Death of

Thomas Cranmer, Late Archebushope of Caunterbury is an

anonymous work which was used by John Foxe in his first

English edition of Acts and Monuments in 1563.<sup>242</sup> A second

biography exists from the pen of Ralph Morice, the archbishop's

secretary. This source was used by Foxe in his second

English edition of Acts and Monuments in 1576.<sup>243</sup>

#### Reliability of Sources Used

The use of all such manuscript and early printed source material presents important problems for sixteenth century historians which cannot lightly be dismissed.

By their very nature, all surviving manuscript sources are incomplete. Fire and natural decay claim victims from manuscript records and the deliberate sorting of files of

---

<sup>239</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 2.

<sup>240</sup> Strype, op. cit., vol. I, p. 38.

<sup>241</sup> L.P.L., Warham's Register, fol. 1v.

<sup>242</sup> This work has been printed in Narratives of the days of the Reformation, edited by J.G. Nichols (Camden Society Publications, 77, 1859).

<sup>243</sup> Cf. ibid., pp. 234-75.

loose documents also leaves its mark. The diverse littere of Thomas Cranmer's Register itself are far from complete. Relatively few documents are registered there for the period 1533-40. Registration in the principal Register could only take place when routine administrative duties had been completed. It is clear that the years after 1530 were a period of great activity in the registry. When the duke of Norfolk wrote to Cranmer in 1533 requesting records concerning the King's divorce from Catherine of Aragon, Cranmer replied:

...as for all manner process had and made in the said matter, they be remaining in the hands of my chancellor, to be reduced in authentic form...<sup>244</sup>

It is clear that allowances must be made for the fact that existing records are incomplete.

Further allowances must be made. In his biography of the archbishop, Strype published the text of Thomas Cranmer's oath of loyalty to the Pope.<sup>245</sup> The oath is recorded three times in the Register.<sup>246</sup> None of the three forms is identical and Strype's version varies considerably from other forms recorded in the manuscript. In the collected edition of Cranmer's Works, Cox recorded the King's mandate to publish the Articles of Religion.<sup>247</sup> The certificate of execution for the deanery of the arches in London is preserved, but Cox failed to note that a number of

---

<sup>244</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 255-6.

<sup>245</sup>Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 331.

<sup>246</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fols 1v.-2, 5 and 5v.

<sup>247</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 533.



rectors were absent.<sup>248</sup>

The dating of manuscripts is of particular importance. Professor Elton, however, has shown that letters were rarely dated by year before 1550. Dates were too often recorded by simply the day or the month.<sup>249</sup> External evidence can sometimes be used to provide hints concerning the date of manuscripts. It is clear, for example, that Thomas Cranmer's legal Commonplace Book was substantially complete by 1535. In that year, the archbishop made use of its contents in sermons preached within the diocese of Canterbury.<sup>250</sup>

Professor Elton has underlined the problems encountered in using evidence from the Tudor State Papers. The worst problem is that the record class known as State Papers consists largely of in-letters. The problems posed by this fact are obvious. As Professor Elton has indicated, Cromwell received thousands of letters. Only some 360 of his own are known to survive. Where only half the evidence exists, it must be treated with great care.<sup>251</sup>

Special problems attach to the use of printed sources, particularly to the use of works from committed reformed historians. It is always legitimate to question an author's objectivity. The anonymous work The Lyfe and Death of Thomas Cranmer was drawn up shortly after Cranmer's

---

<sup>248</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 65v.-6.

<sup>249</sup> Cf. G.R. Elton, England 1200-1640 ([London], 1969), p. 71.

<sup>250</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 326.

<sup>251</sup> Cf. Elton, op. cit., p. 73.

death in 1556. The blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church and the writer was conscious of that fact. The author, nonetheless, was clearly able to disagree with the archbishop's views. At the time of the publication of the Bishops' Book in 1537, the author describes Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine as one of the real presence. He himself calls such an opinion an error.<sup>252</sup> Special problems attach to the work of Ralph Morice. Morice himself was forced to endure some hardship following Cranmer's death.<sup>253</sup> Internal evidence, however, suggests that both these accounts are substantially correct. Both authors give Cranmer's father as Thomas Cranmer of Aslacton.<sup>254</sup> Morice's description of the archbishop's methods of study accords well with the evidence of his surviving manuscript works.<sup>255</sup> The charge to be made against both works is that the authors are writing from memory after the events they describe. Morice himself admitted that his work was 'hastelie pennyd'.<sup>256</sup> It seems best to assume that the testimony of both memoirs can be accepted only with caution.

#### Towards a study of Thomas Cranmer's Register

The King's position as head of the English church

---

<sup>252</sup>Cf. Nichols, op. cit., pp. 223-4.

<sup>253</sup>Dictionary of National Biography [henceforth cited as D.N.B.], ed. by L. Stephen and S. Lee, 72 vols (London, 1885-1913), sub nomine.

<sup>254</sup>Cf. Nichols, op. cit., pp. 218 and 238.

<sup>255</sup>Ibid., pp. 249-50.

<sup>256</sup>Ibid., p. 272.

created a remarkable situation within the ecclesia Anglicana. Following the elevation of Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury in 1533, the King possessed a prelate who was favourable to his marital cause against Catherine of Aragon. Thomas Cranmer's Register is a record of religion, politics and administration in the opening years of the English Reformation.

PART TWO

'God's vice-gerent and Christ's vicar': the relationship between  
the crown and the archbishopric of Canterbury 1533-53

God and Your Highnes hath, I trust, set suche  
an Archebischope over your clergie, as hath bothe  
habillite and volunte abundantli to doo his dew  
service to God, and to Your Highnes his liege  
Lorde, and to his great flock also.<sup>1</sup>

When Hawkins wrote to King Henry VIII from Bologna on 22 February  
1533 to inform the Tudor monarch of the issue of the papal  
bulls for the provision of Thomas Cranmer to the see of  
Canterbury, he carefully emphasised that the King was the  
sole earthly agent responsible for Cranmer's elevation. On  
11 April, Cranmer himself acknowledged that the King alone was  
his patron. When he asked to be allowed to try the King's  
divorce from Catherine of Aragon, he insisted that

...it hath pleased Almighty God, and your grace...  
to call me...unto this high and chargeable  
office of primate and archbishop in this your  
grace's realm...<sup>2</sup>

Such a close relationship between the King and his primate  
was to shape the whole course of Cranmer's pontificate.

---

<sup>1</sup> State Papers...King Henry the Eighth, 11 vols (London, 1830-52) [henceforth cited as St.P.], VII, p. 425; Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII... [A Calendar] ed. by J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner and R.H. Brodie, 21 vols (London, 1862-1910), vol. I [rev. ed.] (1920) and Addenda, 1 vol. (1929-32) [henceforth cited as L.P.], VI, no. 177. The quotation which forms part of the opening title is taken from Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, martyr. 1556 [henceforth cited as P.S., Cranmer II] (Cambridge, 1846), p. 127.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 237-8. The letter survives in two forms; for the second, cf. ibid., pp. 238-9.

Following Henry VIII's assumption of the title supremum caput within the English church, it was perhaps inevitable that the archbishop's role within the church would be modified. Thomas Cranmer's Register itself contains no formal record of the abolition of papal jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup> In itself, this is only to be expected, since mediaeval custom had long regulated the form of documents to be entered in the archiepiscopal Register. It is clear, nonetheless, that the King's new position within the English church caused something of a crisis in the pattern of archiepiscopal administration. It served to qualify Cranmer's relations with his suffragans. In 1535, Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, complained that Cranmer's use of the title totius Anglie primas was in 'derogation and prejudice of the king's high power and authority, being supreme head of the church'.<sup>4</sup> In part, Gardiner was concerned not so much to further the King's cause, but his own. He claimed that Cranmer might not perform a metropolitical visitation of his see on the odd grounds that Warham had visited the see sede vacante after Wolsey's death and that since his clergy paid tenths to the crown they could not afford to pay procurations to the archbishop.<sup>5</sup> Gardiner had been overlooked in the search for a new metropolitan in 1533 and such views clearly reveal that

<sup>3</sup>The formal title at the head of the Register runs simply: 'Registrum Reverendissimi in Christo patris et domini domini Thome, permissione divina Cantuariensis archiepiscopi, totius Anglie primatis'; cf. Lambeth Palace Library[henceforth cited as L.P.L.], Thomas Cranmer's Register[henceforth cited as G.R.], fol. 1.

<sup>4</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 304.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 305-6. Nothing survives concerning the protest in Gardiner's Register. Cf. Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynt. episcoporum Wintoniensium, transcribed and edited for The Canterbury and York Society by H. Chitty (Canterbury and York Society, 37, 1930), passim. Cranmer, however, wrote to Cromwell on the matter and his letter survives.

the bishop still had an axe to grind. His main charge, however, cannot be dismissed so lightly, for Cranmer was forced to make a spirited defence of the use of his own style. He pointed out that when Gardiner had accepted the authority of the bishop of Rome, the Pope possessed a great number of primates under him and 'his supreme authority was not less esteemed, but much the more'. He continued:

Why then may not the king's highness, being supreme head, have primates under him, without any diminishing, but with the augmenting, of his said authority?

Cranmer claimed that if he saw that his own title ran contrary to the King's authority, 'I would sue myself unto his grace, that I might leave it...'.<sup>6</sup>

An equally serious challenge to his authority occurred at this time. An anonymous tract, dated by Strype to the year 1536, attacked the archbishop's audience court.<sup>7</sup> Its authorship is unclear. It may have been written by Gardiner of Winchester or Stokesley of London.<sup>8</sup> Cranmer made a protestation concerning his jurisdiction, but all that survives is the Reply.<sup>9</sup> Mediaeval bishops used their audience courts to try cases of

---

<sup>6</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 304-5.

<sup>7</sup> Strype, Cranmer, I, pp. 81-2 and 366-70; L.P., VIII, no. 705.

<sup>8</sup> Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 81. Professor Lehmberg has cast doubt on the suggestion that Gardiner was the author. Cf. S.E. Lehmberg, 'Supremacy and Vicegerency: A Re-examination' in English Historical Review [henceforth cited as E.H.R.] vol. CCCCIX (April, 1966), p. 231 n. 1. Dr Susan Brigden has cautiously suggested that the author was Stokesley of London, who made such a protest under pressure from Cranmer's jurisdiction; he also faced pressure from the crown. Cf. S. Brigden, The Early Reformation in London, 1520-47: the conflict in the parishes (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1979), pp. 136-9.

<sup>9</sup> Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 366.

heresy, moral offences of the clergy, cases of matrimony, probate and repeated moral offences after punishment.<sup>10</sup> The archbishops and bishops of each province presided in these courts in person or conducted them by auditors, who were under their immediate supervision. The Reply emphasised that 'no archbishop within Christendom hath nor never had any authority to keep any such court by reason of the archbishopric, but only legates of the see of Rome...'.<sup>11</sup> The court called men from the whole realm to London, but the Act in Restraint of Appeals did not allow such a practice.<sup>12</sup> The archbishop's jurisdiction should be given to another by royal commission:

Whereby it shall be known certainly to come from his grace, rather than to join it to the archbishop's see...<sup>13</sup>

The archbishop was not to be the King's legate, for this would 'derogate the power of his grace's general vicar'.<sup>14</sup> Cranmer maintained that he enjoyed such jurisdiction by act of parliament.<sup>15</sup> The writer of the Reply insisted that this statute could not 'be drawn with twenty team of oxen to stretch to the continuance of this court of his audience'.<sup>16</sup> Distinguishing between absolute and dependent jurisdictions, the complainant maintained that the archbishop's audience court did not fall within the

---

<sup>10</sup> D.M. Owen, The Records of the Established Church in England (London, 1970), p. 36.

<sup>11</sup> Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 366.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., pp. 366-7.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 367.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 368; 25 Henry VIII c. 215; Statutes of the Realm, compiled in 11 vols by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins, J. Raithby et al. [henceforth cited as Stat. Realm] (London, 1810-28), vol. III, 470.

<sup>16</sup> Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 368.



terms of the act, which dealt only with exempt religious houses. 'But this act speaketh not of no jurisdiction universal of archbishops, bishops, or other persons'.<sup>17</sup> Returning to practical matters, the writer pointed out that the archbishop possessed a court of arches. Since the audience court was in the jurisdiction of the bishop of London, but the arches was not, the archbishop could oppress the citizens of London first in the arches and then transfer the case to the audience court without breaking the statute '...That no man shall be called out of his own diocese'.<sup>18</sup> Nothing else survives concerning the attack on the archbishop's audience court. The plea that such jurisdiction acted in derogation of the King's supremacy was a vivid illustration of the powers of the King's vicar general and of the King himself in the English church.

It was, perhaps, the fiasco of Thomas Cranmer's metropolitcal visitation in 1535 which illustrated most vividly the problems in the new relationship between church and state. Dr Margaret Bowker has shown that Longland, bishop of Lincoln, used the visitation to help clarify the new bond between church and state.<sup>19</sup> The bishops of Winchester, Exeter and Norwich joined the protest.<sup>20</sup> The president and college of Corpus Christi, Oxford, made a similar plea. On 28 February 1535, the archbishop's registry despatched to the college a citation which

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., pp. 368-9.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 369.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. M. Bowker, 'The Supremacy and the Episcopate: The Struggle for Control, 1534-40' in The Historical Journal, vol. XVIII. 2 (1975), pp. 240-1. Cf. also M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: The Diocese of Lincoln under John Longland 1521-1547 [henceforth cited as Bowker, Reformation] (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 72-6.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. ibid., p. 73.

inhibited their jurisdiction. On 2 March, a certificate of execution was returned from the college, pledging that they would assemble before the archbishop or his commissary '...visitationem vestram metropoliticoam cum qua decet reverencia humiliter subituros, procuraciones quoque reverendissimae paternitati ratione visitationis vestrae metropoliticae huiusmodi debitas soluturos, ulteriusque facturos et recepturos quae in ea parte canonicae diotaverint sanctiones'.<sup>21</sup> In a protestation, however, the college complained 'against the archbishop's visitatorial authority over them':

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. EGO JOHANNES CLAIMOND...  
Praesidens cum omnibus dicti collegii scholaribus  
in his scriptis protestamur et nostrum quilibet  
protestatur quod per aliquam hac vestra venerabili  
visitatione facta seu in posterum fienda  
qualitercunque<sup>22</sup> non intendimus nec aliquis  
nostrum intendit nobis aut alicui nostrum aut  
dioto collegio in aliquo fieri praepjudicium seu  
gravamen aliquod et salvis jure Regis et  
Stephani Winton' dicti collegii visitatoris ac  
privilegiis statutisque dicti collegii nostri  
submittimus et quilibet nostrum submittit vestrae  
venerabili visitationi quatenus de iure  
astringimur et non aliter...<sup>23</sup>[Undated]

The protestation is undated. Stokesley of London complained that

<sup>21</sup>Cf. British Library[henceforth cited as B.L.], Lansdowne MS. 989, fol. 158-v., with diotaverit for diotaverint; L.P., VIII, 316 nos i and ii.

<sup>22</sup>qualitocunque in MS.

<sup>23</sup>B.L., Lansdowne MS. 989, fol. 118; with seu salvis for et salvis.

in the citation which he received for visitation, the archbishop styled himself 'apostolice sedis legatus'.<sup>24</sup> It is not clear if such a title was used in the archbishop's inhibition directed to the college, which ran 'Thomas, permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus etc.'.<sup>25</sup> When the archbishop issued an inhibition to the dean and chapter of Lincoln on 5 August 1534, his title omitted any mention of the style apostolice sedis legatus.<sup>26</sup> On 9 March 1535, the president and fellows acknowledged the King's supremacy. This was probably sworn before the archiepiscopal visitors.<sup>27</sup> At Oxford, the archbishop's officials were armed with a mandate from the crown addressed to all dukes, earls, barons, knights, justices, sherrifs, bailiffs and constables. They were empowered to assist the archbishop in his visitation should he meet resistance: '...eidem reverendissimo patri suisque commissariis, deputatis et officialibus, registris et ministris praedictis in et circa visitationem huiusmodi et eam concernentia quacunque necessaria assistatis...prout nostram in ea parte indignationem volueritis...'.<sup>28</sup> The resistance of the president and college of Corpus Christi, Oxford, does not seem to have been directed against the King as supreme head. When they swore to the royal supremacy, they acknowledged that the marriage between the King and

<sup>24</sup> Cf. B.L., Cotton MS. Cleopatra F II, fols 124-7; printed in Strype, Cranmer, I, pp. 355-60.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. B.L., Lansdowne MS. 989, fol. 158-v.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Lincoln Archive Office [henceforth cited as L.A.O.], Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II, fols 1-4 [first numeration].

<sup>27</sup> The dean and chapter of Lincoln certainly swore to the King's supremacy before the archbishop's visitors; cf. ibid., fol. 9-v.

<sup>28</sup> B.L., Lansdowne MS. 989, fols 158v.-9; cf. L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II, fol. 10-v. [second numeration]. In the

Anne Boleyn was valid. They accepted that the King was supreme head of the church, that the Pope had no greater jurisdiction in England than any foreign bishop and that the Pope's name would no longer be used in sermons. They promised to observe the King's laws, not to twist the text of Holy Scripture against its natural meaning and that in all prayers the King would be named as head of the church.<sup>29</sup> It was a truly comprehensive statement of the government's concept of the new order with no claim omitted. In their protestation, the college swore to do nothing contrary to the King's laws, those of their visitor and the college statutes. Mrs Bowker has shown that Longland also challenged Cranmer's ability to exercise his powers of metropolitanical visitation under the King as supreme head. The college of Corpus Christi, Oxford, certainly protested against the archbishop's jurisdiction, but it is unclear how far they were able to resist his visitation. With the extirpation of Roman jurisdiction in England, the pontificate and the collegiate corporations were forced to re-consider prevailing patterns of ecclesiastical administration. In their protestation, the college of Corpus Christi made no explicit denunciation of the archbishop's style apostolice sedis legatus. It seems

---

copy of the mandate in the Lansdowne MS., Cranmer is not styled apostolice sedis legatus, whereas the title does appear in the form of the mandate registered at Lincoln. The date of the mandate in both versions is correctly given as Westminster, 27 April 1534, but the scribe has incorrectly annotated the copy of the mandate in the British Library with the date 17 April, 1535.

<sup>29</sup> B.L., Lansdowne MS. 989, fols 118-20. The submission of the dean and chapter of Lincoln is recorded in L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II, fol. 9-v.

that like Longland, the college renounced all obedience to the metropolitan's powers which stemmed from Cranmer's papal provision at Rome. Such protests caused the government to consider more closely the position of the English episcopate and it was through Cromwell's use of his office as Vice-Gerent that such a problem was to be solved.

The date of Thomas Cromwell's commission as Vicar General is unclear.<sup>30</sup> Professor Lehmberg has suggested that the title was mooted as early as December 1534.<sup>31</sup> For lack of permanent acta, the role of Thomas Cromwell has always remained something of a mystery. The discovery of a copy of his Vice-Gerent's court book now reveals how significant his position actually was. The contents of the book were copied from a volume in the possession of Mr Saye, whose father was principal registrar for ecclesiastical causes and are dated June 1588.<sup>32</sup> The manuscript belonged to William Beale.<sup>33</sup> The Register shows that Cromwell was active as Vice-gerent from at least 14 October 1535 until 3 February 1540.<sup>34</sup> The existing copy of the Register is brief, for it consists of only seventeen entries. On 20 December 1535, a commission was issued to the bishop of Rochester empowering

<sup>30</sup> The probable draft of the commission is printed in D. Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae [henceforth cited as Wilkins, Concilia], 4 vols (London, 1737), III, pp. 784-5; L.P., VIII, 75(2).

<sup>31</sup> The question of dating is discussed in Lehmberg, art. cit., pp. 225-7.

<sup>32</sup> B.L. Additional MS. [henceforth cited as Add. MS.] 48022, fol. 83.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. G.R. Elton, Policy and Police [henceforth cited as P & P] (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 247-8. It is unclear if Beale copied all he found or simply made extracts from Saye's MS.

<sup>34</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 83 and 96-v.

him to admit and repel preachers in the city and suburbs of London. The commission contained a clause which called on secular officials to help in this task.<sup>35</sup> On 12 January 1536, a preaching licence was issued to one Cardmaker. He was a Franciscan friar, who possessed a bachelor's degree in theology. His licence was valid for the whole kingdom.<sup>36</sup> On 11 March 1536, a commission was issued to Thomas Legh which empowered him to deprive the prior of Winchester cathedral and to proceed to a new election.<sup>37</sup> Nine days later, a similar commission was issued to Legh and to William Petre to deprive the prior of Spalding.<sup>38</sup> On 3 February 1540, a commission was issued from Cromwell's deputies to proceed in a divorce cause between lord Hungerford and his wife.<sup>39</sup> A commission was also issued to receive the oath of supremacy from the Carthusians of London.<sup>40</sup> On 4 February 1537, the court issued a licence to Philip van Wylder, an alien, enabling him to marry Frances Dabonall of London in times prohibited and with the banns being called only once.<sup>41</sup> No licence was issued by the archbishop's court of faculties.<sup>42</sup> The Dispensations Act of 1534 emphasised that it stood to natural reason and equity that in all human laws, the King and parliament could issue dispensations or authorize some person to do so within the realm.<sup>43</sup>

The exercise of such extensive powers was a

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., fols 87-8.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., fol. 88A-Av.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., fols 91-2.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., fols 93v.-4v.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., fol. 96-v.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., fols 95-6.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., fol. 93-v.

<sup>42</sup> D.S. Chambers, Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549 (Oxford, 1966), *passim*.

<sup>43</sup> Stat. Realm, III, pp. 464-5.

remarkable indication of the reality of royal supremacy exercised through the King's deputy, but Cromwell also exercised jurisdiction which directly impinged upon the archbishop's authority. An important modification in the existing pattern of ecclesiastical administration occurred on 23 January 1536 when a commission was issued to William Petre to prove testaments and to receive accounts.<sup>44</sup> Dr Kitching has shown that one act book and one will Register concerning such jurisdiction survive among the records of the prerogative court of Canterbury.<sup>45</sup> Dr Kitching acknowledges that the court was a manifestation of the royal supremacy, but claims that it was unnecessary.<sup>46</sup> Yet, the probate jurisdiction was a source of fees. More importantly, however, it was a conscious attempt to limit the jurisdiction of diocesan bishops. On 30 March 1533, the archbishop issued a commission to Richard Gwent, David Poole and Richard Strete to exercise jurisdiction in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield sede vacante.<sup>47</sup> The testamentary clause of the commission allowed the custodians of the spirituality to prove testaments and to administer the goods of those who died intestate. No limitation was placed on the value of such goods. On 31 December 1535, a commission was issued to Miles Spenser to

---

<sup>44</sup>B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 88Av-90v.; L.P., X, 88.

<sup>45</sup>C.J. Kitching, 'The Probate Jurisdiction of Thomas Cromwell as Vicegerent' in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. XLVI no. 113(May, 1973), pp. 102-3. Dr Kitching also notes that 2 of the 117 causes are non-testamentary. Cf. ibid., p. 105 n. 6.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. ibid., p. 106.

<sup>47</sup>B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 143v.-6.

exercise jurisdiction in the see of Norwich sede vacante.<sup>48</sup>

In this commission, the testamentary clause allowed Spenser to have cognisance in causes of probate where the goods were under £100 in value in the diocese of Norwich and to administer the goods of those who died intestate where the value of the goods was under £100. Two weeks later, the testamentary commission was issued to Petre. The commission empowered him to claim probate of goods valued over £200 in more than one diocese.<sup>49</sup> Dr Bowker has shown that in practice the arrangements were complex.<sup>50</sup> Spenser's commission for jurisdiction in the diocese of Norwich sede vacante, nonetheless, shows that his testamentary jurisdiction was to be curtailed in favour of that of Petre. The threat posed by the Vice-gerency was to be actual as well as potential.

The existing copy of the Vice-Gerent's Register shows, however, that it was during the royal visitation of 1535 that the archbishop's non-curial jurisdiction received its most serious curtailment. Evidence that the secular clergy were visited is slim, but traces of the visitors' activity does at least survive for Wales.<sup>51</sup> In September 1535, an inhibition was despatched to the archbishop.

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., fol. 88-88A. The commission contains a blank space for the name of an additional commissioner.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Kitching, art. cit., p. 102.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Bowker, art. cit., pp. 240-1.

<sup>51</sup> Public Record Office [henceforth cited as P.R.O.], S.P. 1/96, fols 61-2; L.P., IX, 244. The letter to Cromwell from Adam Becansaw and John Vaughan concerns the institution of a clerk to a vacant vicarage in the diocese of St Asaph.



Quia Nos auctoritate nostra suprema ecclesiastica omnia et singula monasteria, domos, prioratus, et loca alia ecclesiastica quascunque, totumque clerum intra et per totum nostrum Angliae regnum constituta propediem visitare statuerimus; vobis ...striote inhibemus atque mandamus, et per vos suffraganeis vestris confratribus episcopis, ac per illos suis archidiaconis intra vestram provinciam Cant' ubilibet constitutis, sic inhiberi volumus atque praecipimus, quatenus pendente visitatione nostra huiusmodi, nullus vestrum ...ea quae sunt jurisdictionis exercere... praesumat...<sup>52</sup>

Cranmer transmitted the mandate to the bishop of London on 2 October.<sup>53</sup> Professor Lehmberg has shown that the purpose behind the inhibition was to underline the fact that the bishops exercised their jurisdiction at the grant of the King alone.<sup>54</sup> It is unclear to what extent Cromwell intended episcopal authority to be permanently curtailed. An undated memorandum shows how far Cromwell's advisers wished to proceed.<sup>55</sup> Richard Gwent was to be licensed to finish causes in the archbishop's courts. Ecclesiastical causes were then to be heard by royal commissioners. The King was to issue a commission in his own name to Gwent and three or four other men. Testamentary causes, especially those worth more than £500, were to be treated in a similar manner. Tithes,

<sup>52</sup>L.A.O., Register 26 [part of John Longland's Register], fol. 261-v. The bishop of London transmitted the mandate from Fulham on 3 October. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 463. The inhibition is not recorded in the archbishop's Register, but is taken from Veysey's Register at Exeter.

<sup>53</sup>L.A.O., Register 26, loc. cit.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Lehmberg, art. cit., pp. 227-9.

<sup>55</sup>P.R.O., S.P. 1/99, fols 231-v.; L.P., IX, 1071.

causes of defamation and perjury were to be judged by laymen. Matrimony and divorce, depending on Scripture, and the probation of small testaments and also institutions were to be committed to the bishops at the King's pleasure to save the time of the King's subjects in long travel.

The plan, however, was not adopted. Licences were issued to the bishops out of the Vice-Gerent's court within a month of the issue of the inhibition.<sup>56</sup> In the copy of the Vice-Gerent's Register, such licences exist for the archdeacon of Lincoln,<sup>57</sup> the dean and chapter of St Paul's, London,<sup>58</sup> the abbot and convent of St Albans,<sup>59</sup> and the prioress and convent of the Poor Clares without Aldgate in London.<sup>60</sup>

Cranmer's licence was delivered in October 1535. The crown granted him the power, at the King's pleasure only, of instituting clerks to and depriving them of their benefices; of collating men to livings; of proving wills of men having bona, iura sive credita in diversis diocesisibus according to the custom of the prerogative court of Canterbury; to proceed in causes whether by complaint or appeal; and to do all else necessary.<sup>61</sup> The archdeacon of Canterbury did not receive his licence until 20 February 1536. He was licensed to prove testaments within the archdeaconry where the goods of the

---

<sup>56</sup> Professor Lehmborg has suggested that from the outset, the inhibition was to last only for a season. Cf. Lehmborg, art. cit., pp. 228-9 and 231.

<sup>57</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fol. 83-v.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., fols 84-5.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., fols 85v.-6.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., fols 86v.-7.

<sup>61</sup> The licence has been omitted from Cranmer's Register. It is recorded in B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fol. 98-v. where it is dated October 1535.

deceased were worth under £100; to instal bishops of the province according to the laws of the realm; to induct clerks into the corporal possession of benefices within Canterbury diocese; to proceed in all causes; and to do all else necessary.<sup>62</sup> Such a licence to the archbishop was of tremendous significance. When he granted a licence to Lady Mary Guildford on 13 February to possess a private oratory for herself and her household wherever she might be in the province of Canterbury, the archiepiscopal style at the head of the licence ran: 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et apostolice sedis legatus natus...'<sup>63</sup> On 18 December 1535, the archbishop's registry issued a decree concerning the award of a pension from the fruits of the parish church of Preston next Faversham.<sup>64</sup> Following the issue of the commission for the exercise of his jurisdiction, Cranmer's archiepiscopal style ran:

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus auctoritate illustrissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri domini Henrici octavi Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Regis, fidei defensoris, Domini Hibernie ac in terris supremae ecclesie anglicane sub Christo capitis sufficienter et legitime deputatus...<sup>65</sup>

The archbishop still exercised jurisdiction Dei gracia, but at the behest of the King and at his pleasure only.

Yet, the issue of the inhibition and the consequent

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., fols 90-1.

<sup>63</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fol. 15; of. Appendix, Commissions and Letters 1.

<sup>64</sup>C.R., fols 29v.-31.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., fol. 29v.

infringement of the prerogatives of the diocesan bishops was not the only curtailment of episcopal authority. The Vice-Gerent's court possessed the power to supplement the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury as metropolitan. By December 1535, Cranmer had recovered the right to exercise jurisdiction over the vacant sees of the province.<sup>66</sup> No Register of the acta sede vacante is recorded in the archbishop's Register before the exercise of such jurisdiction in the diocese of Hereford in 1538.<sup>67</sup> Nine institutions, nonetheless, are recorded for the vacancy in the diocese of St Asaph in 1535 and 1536.<sup>68</sup> At Norwich in December 1535, the royal visitation was still in progress. Following the death of Richard Nykke, therefore, the commission for the exercise of jurisdiction in the diocese was issued out of the Vice-Gerent's court. On 31 December 1535, the court issued a commission to Miles Spenser and to an unnamed official for the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction in the diocese of Norwich sede vacante. The preamble emphasises that all episcopal jurisdiction is suspended during the royal visitation. Because of pressure of business, Cromwell cannot exercise such jurisdiction in person. Authority which was given to Richard Nykke, bishop of Norwich, is now to

<sup>66</sup> The mediaeval privileges of the archbishop are treated in I.J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration [henceforth cited as Churchill, Administration], 2 vols (London, 1933), I, pp. 161-240 and II, pp. 41-118.

<sup>67</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 89-104v.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., fol. 358-v. The dates of the institutions are 16 August, 14 September and 1 December 1535, 4, 11 and 28 January, 4, 8 and 10 February 1536. The institutions are calendared in A.J. Edwards, The sede vacante Administration of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer 1533-53 (Unpublished M. Phil. dissertation, University of London, 1968), pp. 149-50.

be deputed to Cromwell's nominees:

Quia tamen dictus Richardus nuper Norwicensis  
episcopus viam universi carnis est ingressus et<sup>69</sup>  
dictus Thomas Cromwell nostris et dicti regni  
nostri Anglie tot et tam arduis negotiis adhuc  
adeo prepeditus existat quod ad iurisdictionem  
predictam sede episcopali predicta vacante  
in dicta diocese Norwicensi in sua persona  
expediendum non sufficiet, vobis igitur vices  
suas in hac parte commiserit vosque substituerit.<sup>70</sup>

Spenser is empowered to prove the wills of those who die in the diocese where the value of the goods is under £100. He is to possess similar jurisdiction over the goods of those who die intestate, provided that their goods are under £100 in value.<sup>71</sup> The clause is significant because it was not until two weeks later that William Petre was issued with a testamentary commission which modified the existing pattern of probate jurisdiction. Spenser is also empowered to admit men to benefices, to proceed in all causes belonging to the bishop of Norwich, either by complaint, appeal or devolution, and to perform all else which pertains to him which is also contained in the late bishop's commission. Thomas Godsalva, notary public, is to be scribe of the acts. The issue of such a commission was of tremendous significance. Under mediaeval composition, the archbishop was empowered to appoint at will an official to exercise jurisdiction sede vacante in all matters save that of visitation. For the exercise of the latter authority, the

<sup>69</sup> et omitted in MS.

<sup>70</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fol. 88v.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., fol. 88-88A; of. Appendix, Thomas Cromwell's Register, 2.

chapter within fifteen days were to nominate to the archbishop three suitable persons from whom the archbishop might select one.<sup>72</sup> The non-curial records of Spenser's jurisdiction survive among the episcopal acta at Norwich. The records of institutions sede vacante give testimony to Spenser's remarkable authority. They were performed

per venerabilem virum Magistrum Milonem Spenser,  
legum doctorem, infra civitatem et diocesim  
Norwicensem sede episcopali ibidem vacante  
custodem spiritualitatis et vicarium generalem  
autoritate regia supremi ecclesie anglicane  
capitis legitime deputatum a xii<sup>o</sup> die mensis  
Januarii [1536]...usque festum Sancte Trinitatis  
xi<sup>o</sup> videlicet die mensis Junii...<sup>73</sup>

During the vacancy, an ordination was held on the authority of the keeper of the spiritualities by John Calceidoniensis;<sup>74</sup> three clerks were ordained to minor orders. A marginal heading

<sup>72</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 196-7.

<sup>73</sup> Norfolk and Norwich Record Office [henceforth cited as N.N.R.O.], Register 10/16, fol. 7; with episcopale for episcopali and vacante omitted.

<sup>74</sup> N.N.R.O., ORR/1a, fol 27. The bishop was John Underwood, who had been consecrated as bishop of Chalcedon in 1505 and remained bishop until his death in 1541. Cf. A.B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500 (Cambridge, 1963), p. 604. Elsewhere, Underwood's activity as bishop of Chalcedon in England is noted simply for the period 1505-31; he is described as suffragan bishop in the diocese of Norwich; cf. Sir F.M. Powicke and E.B. Fryde, Handbook of British Chronology, 2nd ed. (London, 1961), p. 268. Matthew Mackarell is also noted as bishop of Chalcedon. He was active in the diocese of York (1524-8) and Lincoln (1533-7); cf. ibid., p. 269. Stubbs shows that Mackarell was provided to the see of Chalcedon on 28 April 1524. Cf. W. Stubbs, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1897), p. 202. Unusually, there seem to have been two bishops in partibus consecrated to the same see. On existing evidence, Underwood's activity was confined to the diocese of Norwich.

gives the date as 15 June, but this must be incorrect. Twenty-eight institutions to benefices were also made during the period.<sup>75</sup> No further records survive concerning the grant of this important commission to Spenser. Although evidence is scarce, it seems that the mediaeval composition between the churches of Norwich and Canterbury was ignored. The commission to Spenser was issued out of the Vice-Gerent's court as a consequence of the royal visitation. Yet, the crown also wished to secure obedience to the new testamentary clause contained in that document since Petre had not yet been empowered to act as Cromwell's deputy in matters of probate. The display of supremacy would also help to counter Nykke's influence in the diocese, for the previous bishop had offered resistance to the crown. In 1534, a praemunire indictment was issued against him for infringing the immunity of the town of Thetford from his spiritual jurisdiction. He eventually received a royal pardon, confirmed by act of parliament. Cromwell used the case to attempt to bring the prelate to heel. Nykke made a formal recognition of the royal supremacy on 10 March 1535.<sup>76</sup>

Further archiepiscopal privileges were also challenged.

---

<sup>75</sup>N.N.R.O., Register 10/16, fols 7v.-27. Three were performed in January, five in February, twelve in March, two in April, five in May and one in June.

<sup>76</sup>Dictionary of National Biography, ed. in 72 vols by L. Stephen and S. Lee (London, 1885-1913) [henceforth cited as D.N.B.], sub nomine, where the date of Nykke's recognition of the royal supremacy is incorrectly given as 1534; L.P., VIII, 311. Cf. also J.J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII [henceforth cited as Scarisbrick, Henry VIII] (London, 1968), p. 330. Nykke died before 29 December 1535.

On 15 October 1535, the court issued a mandate to the dean and chapter of Hereford to instal Edward Fox as bishop of that see.<sup>77</sup> The election of Fox was confirmed by the archbishop on 15 September 1535.<sup>78</sup> The royal mandate for enthronement explicitly stated:

...quibus quidem electioni, confirmationi et consecrationi nos assensum et consensum nostrum regium adhibuimus et favorem, vobis igitur committimus ac firmiter iniungendo mandamus quatenus prenominationum electum, confirmatum<sup>79</sup> et consecratum seu eius procuratorem legitimum ad et in realem, actualement et corporalem possessionem dicte ecclesie cathedralis Herefordensis et dignitatis episcopalis eiusdem cum omnibus suis honoribus, privilegiis, prerogativis, preeminenciis ac iuribus et pertinenciis suis universis<sup>80</sup> iuxta et secundum prefate ecclesie statuta et approbatas consuetudines atque preteriti temporis morem inducatis...<sup>81</sup>

The issue of such a royal mandate may result from the inhibition on the exercise of episcopal jurisdiction issued by the crown on 18 September. The exact date of Cranmer's commission for the exercise of his jurisdiction is not recorded. A similar mandate, however, was issued from the court to the

<sup>77</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fol. 85. Cf Appendix, Thomas Cromwell's Register 1. Normally the archdeacon of Canterbury performed the task. Cf. C.R., fols 229-35v.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., fol. 173

<sup>79</sup> confirmatu in MS.

<sup>80</sup> universalis in MS.

<sup>81</sup> Fox was consecrated on 26 September 1535; cf. J.M. Horn, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541, 12 vols (London, 1962-7), II, p. 3.



archdeacon of Llandaff cathedral on 4 May 1537 to instal Robert Holgate as their bishop.<sup>82</sup> The display of power may have been caused by the opposition of the previous bishop, the Spaniard George de Athequa, who had been a member of the household of Catherine of Aragon. He had refused to acknowledge the act of succession in 1534 and the King's supremacy in 1535. In the royal visitation of that year, the bishopric had been effectively sequestered. After Catherine of Aragon's death, he was arrested for attempting to leave the country without a passport and was imprisoned. He was released into the custody of Eustace Chapuys and granted a passport in September 1536. He formally resigned the see before 2 March 1537. Holgate was consecrated as the new bishop on 25 March 1537.<sup>83</sup>

Following the termination of the royal visitation, full episcopal jurisdiction was restored to the bishops. The Vice-Gerent's court issued a commission for visitation to the bishop of Hereford in July 1536.<sup>84</sup> Stephen Gardiner's Register records no similar licence for that diocese.<sup>85</sup> A similar licence, however, was issued to Cranmer in 1537.<sup>86</sup> Dr Bowker has shown that John Longland at Lincoln was also given such

<sup>82</sup> Cf. B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 94v.-5; of. Appendix, Thomas Cromwell's Register. 3.

<sup>83</sup> L.P., VI, 1541; VII, 135, 726; VIII, 190, 311, 494 and 803; IX, 806; X, 429; XI, 80, 479(p. 194); XIV, pt ii, 781(fol. 57b); J.M. Horn, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541, 12 vols (London, 1962-7), XI, p. 23. Cf. L.P.L., C.R., fol. 200.

<sup>84</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 92-3; printed in Wilkins, Concilia, III, p. 810.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynt. episcoporum Wintoniensium, ed. by H.E. Malden and H. Chitty (Canterbury and York Society, 37, 1930), passim.

<sup>86</sup> The licence does not survive, but of. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 338.

a licence.<sup>87</sup> The Vice-Gerency died with Cromwell. Yet the years between 1535 and 1540 were of tremendous significance in the relationship between the King and primate. Cromwell used his office as Vice-Gerent with skill and insight. Through the use of his powers, he placed upon the see of Canterbury a new duty of Christian Obedience which is clearly reflected in the primate's new archiepiscopal style. The surviving records of the Vice-Gerent's court show that in his ability to inhibit or supplement the archbishop's metropolitanical jurisdiction, Thomas Cromwell wielded important powers which forged a new relationship between church and state during the years of his ascendancy.

It was the statute of 1534 which altered the method of appointing bishops to English diocesan sees.<sup>88</sup> By the terms of the act, papal bulls of provision were no longer the central document in the process of episcopal appointments. Under the system of papal provision, bulls were issued at Rome for the appointment of prelates to episcopal sees. Yet, diocesan chapters met to elect formally the new bishop. Chapters elected and Popes invariably appointed the royal nominee. After 1534, the letters missive sent by the crown to the cathedral chapter become in effect papal bulls of provision. Capitular election of the royal nominee and metropolitanical confirmation of that election are formalities to complete the process of appointment. Yet, it was not

---

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Bowker, art. cit., p. 242.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Stat. Realm. III, 462-4 and Churchill, Administration, I, 254-9.

until 1535 that formal renunciations of papal jurisdiction were obtained from bishops appointed before that statute was enacted. Seventeen renunciations survive. Eleven were made in February, four in March, one each in April and June.<sup>89</sup> So thorough were the government's actions that even bishops appointed after the statute of 1534 made the renunciation.<sup>90</sup> Cranmer renounced his appointment at the hands of the Pope on 10 February 1535.<sup>91</sup> The text is the same, with minor verbal variations, as that sworn by Roland Lee on 27 February.<sup>92</sup> Cranmer swore that from henceforth 'nulle externo imperatori. Regi, principi aut prelato, nec Romano pontifici (quem Papam vocant) fidelitatem et obedienciam...promittam aut dare vel dari curabo'. He confessed that the Roman primacy was not founded in Holy Scripture, but was simply an institution erected by human authority. He swore to defend the laws of the realm enacted against the bishop of Rome's jurisdiction. All bulls

<sup>89</sup> Cranmer(Canterbury), Gardiner(Winchester), Clerk(Bath and Wells), Stokesley(London), Goodrich(Ely), Longland(Lincoln), Kite(Carlisle), Lee(York), Salcote(Bangor), Sherborne(Chichester), and Lee(Coventry and Lichfield) made the renunciation in February; Tunstall(Durham), Veysey(Exeter), Nykke(Norwich) and Booth(Hereford) swore to the oath in March; Rawlins(St David's) in April and Standish(St Asaph) in June. Cf. L.P., VIII, 190, 311, 494 and 803.

<sup>90</sup> Both Goodrich and Salcott, for example, were appointed in this way. Cf. L.P.L., C.R., fols 81-7v. and 157-63.

<sup>91</sup> L.P., VIII, 190. The original renunciation survives in P.R.O., E 25, 26 pt 3. It is signed Thomas Cantuar' and is endorsed 'Canturbery'.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. T. Rymer, Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque generis acta publica [henceforth cited as Foedera] 20 vols (vols 16-20 ed. by R. Sanderson)(London, 1704-35), XIV, pp. 549-50. An English translation of the Latin renunciation sworn by Stephen Gardiner on 10 February is given in J. Foxe, Acts and Monuments [henceforth cited as A & M], ed. in 8 vols by J. Pratt(London, 1877), V, pp. 71-2.

and briefs from Rome were to be surrendered to the crown. It was a comprehensive rejection of papal supremacy.

Following the passage of the statute of 1534 regulating the appointment of diocesan bishops, each newly appointed bishop was to swear an oath to the crown. Little survives concerning such oaths in Crammer's Register. Goodrich of Ely and Lee of Coventry and Lichfield both swore such oaths.<sup>93</sup> The heading to Goodrich's oath shows that it was to be taken by every person elected or presented to any archbishopric or bishopric. Lee swore to 'sustain, and maintain the honour ...and prerogative of your majesty...and jurisdiction of your imperial crown of the same...'. He promised to take no further oath contrary to his oath to the crown:

AND also I acknowledge and recognize your majesty immediately under Almighty God to be the chief and supreme head of the church of England...

He then acknowledged the bestowal of the temporalities of the see. Having pledged to maintain the statutes against papal provisions, Lee swore to uphold

the whole effects and contents of the statute made for the surety of your succession of your crown of this realm, and all causes and articles mentioned and contained in the said statute...<sup>94</sup>

<sup>93</sup>For Goodrich's oath, cf. P.R.O., S.P. 1/83, fols 59v.-60 [damaged]; L.P., VII, 427. With minor variations, this oath is similar to that sworn by Lee. Cf. G. Burnet, History of the reformation of the Church of England [henceforth cited as Hist. Ref.], ed. in 7 vols by N. Pocock (Oxford, 1865), VI, pp. 290-1. The oath was sworn by Lee as bishop elect. Lee's election was confirmed on 16 April 1534. Cf. ibid. and C.R., fols 149-56.

<sup>94</sup>Cf. ibid., fols 81-7v.; cf. Stat. Realm. III, 471-4.

It was a comprehensive statement of the new order.

From 1 July 1536, a formal oath of supremacy was demanded of all newly appointed office holders.<sup>95</sup> The Succession act of that year also required an oath.<sup>96</sup> In 1543, a third Succession act was passed following the King's marital adventures and the two oaths were amalgamated 'Forasmuche as in bothe the saide Othes mencioned in the saide severall Actes there lacketh full and sufficient wordes, wherby some doubtis myght arise....'.<sup>97</sup> Throughout the period, oaths seem to have been taken before the King and the archbishop or their deputies. Lee's oath was clearly designed to be sworn before the crown, for the King is addressed in the second person throughout.<sup>98</sup> Blank forms for the oath of 1536 survive.<sup>99</sup> It was highly significant, however, that the archbishop's jurisdiction in the appointment of bishops was also used to secure obedience.

When Robert Holgate became archbishop of York in 1545, he professed:

I Robert, archebussshop of Yorke electe, having nowe the vale of darkness of the usurped power, auctoritie, and jurisdiction of the see and bussshope of Rome clerely taken away from myne yeis,

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., pp. 663-6; cf. Elton, P & P, pp. 229-30.

<sup>96</sup> Stat. Realm., III, pp. 655-62.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., pp. 955-6.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. P.R.O., S.P. 1/83, fols 59v.-60; L.P., VII, 427; Burnet, Hist. Ref., VI, pp. 290-1. Cf. also Calendar of state papers, domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI. Mary, Elizabeth, & James I 1547-(1625), ed. by R. Lemon and M.A.E. Green, 12 vols (London, 1856-72), vol. [1], p. 33 no. 27.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Elton, P & P, p. 229 n. 3 and L.P., Addenda I, i, no. 914.

do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that nether the see, nor the busshope of Rome, nor any foraine potestate hath, nor ought to have any jurisdiction, power or auctoritie within this realme, nether by God's lawe, nor by any juste lawe or meanes...

He promised to bear true allegiance to the King as 'th'only supreme heade of the churohe of England and Ireland in earthe under God...'. He swore to obey the Succession acts of 1536 and 1543 and to defend all statutes passed in derogation of the 'usurped and pretended' power of the bishop of Rome.<sup>100</sup> Such an oath formed part of the acta confirmationis before the archbishop or his deputy. When Bonner was appointed to the see of London in 1539, the oath of supremacy was sworn by his proctor immediately before the issue of the definitive sentence.<sup>101</sup> At his consecration, he again proffered the oath to the consecrating bishops.<sup>102</sup> The swearing of an oath of supremacy continued into the reign of Edward VI.<sup>103</sup> After 1547, appointments to vacant episcopal sees were made by the simple despatch of letters patent. When John Scory was appointed to the see of Rochester in 1551, he swore an oath of supremacy to the crown.<sup>104</sup> He renounced 'the Bishop of Rome, and his authority, power, and jurisdiction'. He accepted 'the King's Majesty to be the only supreme head in earth, of the church

<sup>100</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 309; Wilkins, Concilia, III, 870-1.

<sup>101</sup> C.R., fols 241-7v.

<sup>102</sup> Foxe, A & M, V, p. 162.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Stat. Realm, IV, i, pp. 18-22, and 144-6. The royal injunctions of 1547 urged that all laws and statutes of the King's supremacy were to be observed. Cf. Tudor Royal Proclamations, ed. in 3 vols by P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin [henceforth cited as Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations] (New Haven, 1964-69), I, pp. 393-4.

<sup>104</sup> C.R., fols 333-4. He was consecrated on 30 August 1551.

of England...'. He then pledged to observe all statutes concerning the extirpation of Roman jurisdiction and the maintenance of the King's power as supreme head.<sup>105</sup> Such oaths did not preclude an oath of loyalty to the archbishop himself:

I N. chosen Bishop of the church and see of N.  
do profess and promise all due reverence and  
obedience to the Archbishop and to the  
Metropolitcal church of N. and to their  
successors, so help me God and his holy Gospel.

Ponet swore such an oath when appointed to Rochester in 1550.<sup>106</sup> Such an oath, however, was clearly subordinate to that taken by Ponet to the crown. Before he swore obedience to the church of Canterbury, Ponet first swore loyalty to the supreme head of that church.<sup>107</sup> The swearing of such oaths was a powerful indication of the government's attempts to enforce the new political order in church and state.

During Cranmer's pontificate, the archbishop was called upon to confirm elections to two archiepiscopal sees. Robert Holgate was appointed to York in 1545 and George Browne to Dublin in 1536.<sup>108</sup> In both cases, the solemnities of consecration included the bestowal of the pallium. The pallium

<sup>105</sup> The Two Liturgies A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552 with other documents set forth by authority in the reign of King Edward VI [henceforth cited as P.S., Liturgies] edited for The Parker Society by J. Ketley (Cambridge, 1844), pp. 168-9 and 338-9. Cf. C.R., fol. 333v.

<sup>106</sup> P.S., Liturgies, pp. 182 and 350. Cf. C.R., fol. 331v. The terms of the profession are identical to the mediaeval Latin oath. Cf. Churchill, Administration, II, pp. 131-2.

<sup>107</sup> C.R., fol. 331-v.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., fols 306-10 and 183-7v. respectively.

was the symbol of an archbishop's metropolitan authority and was sent from Rome. By the sixteenth century, the delivery of the pallium was directly associated with the profession of obedience by the archbishop to the papal see.<sup>109</sup> In the acta consecrationis of Browne to Dublin, the record shows that on 19 March 1536 the archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the bishops of Salisbury and Rochester, consecrated Browne and surrendered to him the pallium. When Holgate was appointed to the see of York in 1545, the acta recorded in the archbishop's Register are more complex. Following the issue of the definitive sentence, the archbishop's chaplain celebrated Mass. When this was over, the archbishop blessed the pallium and placed it on Holgate's shoulders. The prayers before its bestowal reveal that it was to be regarded as a sign of his archiepiscopal authority:

Summe vere sacerdos ac eterne pontifex domine  
Jesu, a quo omnis honor et potestas principium  
obtinuit et effectum, benedicere et sanctificare  
digneris hoc pontificalis dignitatis  
plenitudinis insigne...<sup>110</sup>

The source of human authority for the bestowal of the pallium, however, was different from that laid down in mediaeval

<sup>109</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 158-9. When Thomas Cranmer received the pallium from Clement VII, he swore the oath of loyalty to the see of Rome. Cf. Appendix, Papal Bulls, 12.

<sup>110</sup> C.R., fol. 309v., with obtinuit for obtinuit. The records concerning the bestowal of the pallium are transcribed in W. Stubbs, 'Archbishop Holdegate's Pall' in The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Review (1860, pt ii), pp. 522-4.



canon law. A comparison of the form of words used at the bestowal of the pallium in 1414 when Henry Chichele was provided to the see of Canterbury by the Pope with those used at Holgate's consecration reveals the point.<sup>111</sup> Whereas the fifteenth century formula stressed that the pallium was taken de corpore Beati Petri, the sixteenth century text omitted all reference to St Peter and stressed simply that the pallium was 'sacerdotii domini nostri Jesu Christi signum'. More significantly, however, the fifteenth century text laid down that the Pope was the sole human agent responsible for the bestowal of the woollen garment. The Tudor rite maintained that the pallium was bestowed in honour of Henry VIII 'cui soli et nulli alii obedienciam et fidelitatem debes et exhibuisti in decus ecclesie Anglicane...'. The bestowal of the pallium, therefore, was not an anachronism,<sup>112</sup> but a powerful demonstration of the reality of the royal supremacy within the church. Tillyard has shown that the Tudors could picture the whole of creation as a Chain of Being stretching down from God's throne. The King was Head among the Body's members. In Richard II, Shakespeare gave testimony to such views when he wrote of the King:

Yet looks he like a king: behold, his eye

---

<sup>111</sup>The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury 1414-43, ed. in 4 vols by E.F. Jacob and H.C. Johnson (Canterbury and York Society, 42, 45-7, 1937-47), I, 17. Cf. C.R., fols 309v.-10.

<sup>112</sup>Cf. A.G. Dickens, Robert Holgate: Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North (London, 1955), p. 18. Stubbs argued that whilst the prayers were almost identical to those customarily used, the benedictio pallii was possibly an original creation. Cf. Stubbs, loc. cit.

Henry Chichele(Canterbury) 1414

FORMA DANDI PALLEUM. AD HONOREM

canipotentis dei et beate Marie  
Virginis et beatorum Petri et

Pauli

et domini nostri Johannis Pape

xxiiij et sancte Romane

ecclesie neonon Cantuarien'

ecclesie

tibi commisse, tradimus tibi

palleum de corpore beati

Petri sumptum, plenitudinem

pontificalis officii, ut utaris

eo<sup>113</sup> infra ecclesiam tuam

ceteris diebus qui exprimentur in

privilegiis ei ab apostolica sede

concessis

<sup>113</sup>ean in MS.

Robert Holgate(York) 1545

Traditio pallii. Ad honorem Dei Patris

Omnipotentis, Filii et Spiritus

Sancti intemerateque Virginis

Mariæ et totius celestis exercitus

ac illustrissimi et serenissimi in

Christo Principis et domini nostri

domini Henrici Octavi etc. cui

soli et nulli alii obedienciam et

fidelitatem debes et exhibuisti in decus

Ecclesie Anglicane ac Metropolitice Ecclesie

Eboracensis

tibi commisse traditum tibi

est<sup>114</sup> pallium

in plenitudine pontificalis dignitatis

ut eo utaris in divinis

celebrandis infra ecclesiam tuam

et alias diebus ab antiquo

usitatis

<sup>114</sup>est omitted in MS.

As bright as is the eagle's, lightens forth  
Controlling majesty.<sup>115</sup>

When Henry VIII claimed to bestow the pallium upon Holgate and Browne, the nature of that insignia changed from being papal and sacerdotal to political and religious. The pallium continued to be a sign of metropolitanical authority, but it was for the King alone on earth to appoint archbishops and to bestow jurisdiction upon them. This was now symbolized by the King's grant of the pallium.

If the crown was concerned to ensure that the new methods of appointing bishops to diocesan sees faithfully reflected the new political order in church and state, it was natural that the government should also turn its attention to preachers. Cranmer himself held the office of preaching in very high regard. Within the text of the Articles of Religion of 1553, Thomas Cranmer insisted that preaching was one of the true marks of the Church:

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation  
of faithful men, in which the pure word of God  
is preached...<sup>116</sup>

The abortive Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum likewise insisted: 'Quoniam concionandi munus populo Dei maxime necessarium est. Ecclesia nunquam illo destitui debet'.<sup>117</sup>

It is clear, moreover, that the archbishop used his administrative

<sup>115</sup>E.M.W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture (Harmondsworth, repr. 1972), p. 38. The idea of the Chain and its links is set out in ibid., pp. 33-44 and 45-90.

<sup>116</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 531.

<sup>117</sup>The Reformation of The Ecclesiastical Laws as attempted in the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth, ed. in a new edition by E. Cardwell [henceforth cited as R.L.E.] (Oxford, 1850), p. 35.

powers to enforce the new order in church and state. No preaching licences survive within the archiepiscopal Register and only a handful are recorded in the Faculty Office registers of the period, which seems to have exercised a parallel jurisdiction in isolated cases.<sup>118</sup> The archbishop, nevertheless, was careful to use his influence to support the position of the crown within the English church. Where individuals had incurred the government's displeasure, he ensured that they had received dispensation from that body before he granted them a preaching licence.<sup>119</sup> It was perhaps to further his own concept of obedience in church and state that he wrote to the archbishop of York requesting preaching licences for his own nominees. The York Registers show that on 9 July 1539, Richard Champion and John Thixtill were granted such licences 'ad requisitionem domini Cant' archiepiscopi'.<sup>120</sup> He also requested royal preaching licences for preachers outside his diocese. Such a request exists for the diocese of Norwich in 1537.<sup>121</sup>

Professor Elton has shown that from 1535, Cromwell was able to turn his attention to the problems connected with the enforcement of the new political settlement in the parishes. He did this with a remarkable series of circular letters to the bishops and secular officials.<sup>122</sup> No evidence concerning

<sup>118</sup> L.P.L., F1/Vv, fols 9, 44 and 58; F1/A, p. 8; calendared in D.S. Chambers, Faculty Office registers 1534-1549 (Oxford, 1966), p. xxiv and n. 5.

<sup>119</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 252.

<sup>120</sup> B.I., Register 28 [archbishop Lee's Register], fol. 137v. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 304, 317, 321 and 385.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., p. 336.

<sup>122</sup> Elton, P & P, pp. 231-62.

Cranmer's execution of the instructions survives in his archiepiscopal Register, but his surviving letters do indicate how closely he was involved in the enforcement of the new order. Cromwell opened his series of letters with one dated 4 June 1535.<sup>123</sup> Bishops were to preach on the royal supremacy each Sunday and to ensure that their subordinates did likewise. Schoolmasters were to teach the same point. The word papa was to be erased from all service books. Cranmer received the letter on 4 June. Unfortunately, he sent his doubts concerning certain points by word of mouth. Nevertheless, he promised 'to satisfy the king's grace's express commandment in every point to the most of my power...as speedily as I may...'.<sup>124</sup> Professor Elton has shown that the bishops reacted in various ways. Cromwell enclosed articles for unlearned priests.<sup>125</sup> Clerk of Bath and Wells and Lee of York drew up their own articles.<sup>126</sup> The problem presented by such clerics was pressing. Edward Lee of York told Cromwell that only twelve secular priests in his diocese could preach. Some benefices were so poorly endowed that men would not take them. Those who held the best benefices were non-resident.<sup>127</sup> Cranmer himself

---

<sup>123</sup>The circular has not survived, but Professor Elton has re-constructed its contents. Cf. ibid., p. 232 n. 1. This circular was the second in the series, which began on 16 April 1535. Cf. ibid., p. 231 and n. 1.

<sup>124</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 306-7. Goodrich of Ely issued orders to his clergy concerning the government's demands on 27 June. Cf. University Library of Cambridge [henceforth cited as U.L.C.] Ely Diocesan Records [henceforth cited as E.D.R.], G/1/7 [part of Goodrich's Register], fol. 125.

<sup>125</sup>Elton, P & P, pp. 233-4.

<sup>126</sup>Ibid., pp. 234-5.

<sup>127</sup>L.P., VIII, 963.

strove to overcome such obstacles by a preaching tour of the diocese. Since Otford and Knole were sufficiently instructed, he went to eastern Kent and to Canterbury 'only by preaching to persuade the people'.<sup>128</sup> In his sermons, he stressed three points. He emphasised that 'the bishop of Rome was not God's vicar in earth'. He showed that the title sanctissimus papa was inappropriate. He also denied that the Roman canon law was equal to God's law. He met resistance from the prior of the Black Friars at Canterbury and sent a full report to Cromwell.<sup>129</sup> Interestingly, the archbishop used as the source for his ideas the manuscript compilation known as his legal Commonplace Book.<sup>130</sup> It was an impressive display of obedience from a primate who was fully convinced, on theological grounds, of the new order in both church and state. The King was 'of very right and by God's law...the supreme head of this church of England, next immediately unto God'.<sup>131</sup>

If the archbishop sought to enforce the royal supremacy through preaching tours, it is equally clear that the crown forced the bishops into conformity through its exercise of the powers of visitation. As early as 1534, the crown used the archbishop's powers of metropolitocal visitation to enforce the new order. No records concerning the archbishop's activities, however, survive within his Register. Between

---

<sup>128</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 326.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., pp. 326-8.

<sup>130</sup> For each of the points, of. Strype, Cranmer, vol. III Appendix and Addenda [henceforth cited as A & A], p. 820, p. 751 and pp. 752-3. For a full discussion of this crucial text, of. Chapter 2, Supremacy and Obedience, *passim*.

<sup>131</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 326.

April 1534 and January 1535, religious corporations and the parochial clergy swore an oath of supremacy.<sup>132</sup> Cranmer was appointed as a commissioner to administer such an oath. On 27 April, a mandate was entrusted to him addressed to secular officials, forbidding resistance to the visitation.<sup>133</sup> The dean and chapter of London swore the oath on 20 June. They acknowledged that the marriage of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn was lawful, that the King was supreme head of the church and that the bishop of Rome had no authority within the kingdom.<sup>134</sup> Dr Susan Brigden has shown that during the summer of 1534, the other religious corporations and the parochial clergy set their signatures and seals to the deliberations. Lists of 356 signatures for the London clergy exist.<sup>135</sup> No resistance was met.<sup>136</sup>

The first set of royal injunctions, issued in 1536, stipulated that all clerics were to enforce the statutes which abolished the 'pretensed and usurped power and jurisdiction' of the bishop of Rome and confirmed the King's jurisdiction as supreme head of the church. Clerics were to preach on this theme every Sunday for the following quarter and at

---

<sup>132</sup> For the general administration of the oath, cf. Elton, *P & P*, pp. 228-30.

<sup>133</sup> *L.P.*, VII, 589(7). All the surviving submissions are calendared in *L.P.*, VII, 665, 865, 921, 1024, 1121, 1216, 1347, 1594; *L.P.*, VIII, 31.

<sup>134</sup> *L.P.*, VII, 865.

<sup>135</sup> S. Brigden, *The Early Reformation in London, 1520-47: the conflict in the parishes* (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, University of Cambridge, 1979), pp. 136-9.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. Elton, *loc. cit.*

least twice every quarter thereafter.<sup>137</sup> These stipulations were re-inforced by the injunctions of 1538.<sup>138</sup> Cranmer's first set of surviving injunctions dates from his metropolitical visitation of the diocese of Worcester in 1535.<sup>139</sup> The injunctions are thirteen in number. Dated at Knole, an archiepiscopal palace, on 22 February they give no directions as to the enforcement of the royal supremacy within the church. By 1538, Cranmer followed the lead of the royal injunctions. On 8 May, 1538, Cranmer began his administration of the diocese of Hereford sede vacante following the death of Edward Fox.<sup>140</sup> The archbishop's commission to Hugh Coren as custodian of the spiritualities sede vacante is also dated 8 May.<sup>141</sup> The inhibition to the archdeacon of Hereford for a visitation sede vacante is dated at Lambeth on 9 May.<sup>142</sup> Schedules of the visitation for the archdeaconries of Hereford and Shropshire are entered in the archbishop's Register.<sup>143</sup> Both sets of royal injunctions were directed to be administered to the clergy deanery by deanery.<sup>144</sup> The two sets of royal injunctions were supported by a set from Cranmer himself.

<sup>137</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 97v.; all the injunctions are printed in Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 269-74.

<sup>138</sup> C.R., fols 215v.-16v.; printed in Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 275-81. Cf. Elton, P & P, pp. 247-9, 251-2 and 254-5.

<sup>139</sup> The injunctions are printed in E.H.R., vol. XLI(1926), pp. 420-3.

<sup>140</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 89.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., fols 89v.-90v. It was presented to Coren in the chapel of Lea in the parish of Linton by Thomas Baynham on 13 May; cf. ibid., fol. 89.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., fols 90v.-91v.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., fols 91v.-2.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., fol. 101.



The first injunction ran:

First; That ye and every one of you shall, with all your diligence and faithful obedience, observe, and cause to be observed, all and singular the king's highness' injunctions, by his grace's commissaries given in such places as they in times past have visited.<sup>145</sup>

Cromwell's letter accompanying the second set of royal injunctions is dated 30 September.<sup>146</sup> Cranmer followed up his visitation of the diocese of Hereford sede vacante with a mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury on 11 October.<sup>147</sup> Transmitting the injunctions and Cromwell's accompanying letter, the archbishop ordered the archdeacon of Canterbury to assemble before him the clergy and people of the diocese and to recite to them the contents of the enclosures. The Register notes that similar mandates were sent to John Butler, commissary general in Calais, to the dean of South Malling and to the dean of Booking.<sup>148</sup> Between 1534 and 1538, Cromwell was successful in obtaining Cranmer's full support in the policy of enforcement.

As diocesan and metropolitan of Canterbury, the archbishop possessed the power to transmit mandates throughout the diocese and to the bishops of the southern province. The Diverse Littere within the archbishop's Register underline

---

<sup>145</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 81.

<sup>146</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fol. 215-v.; printed in R.B. Merriman, Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell, 2 vols (Oxford, 1902), II, pp. 156-7.

<sup>147</sup>C.R., loc. cit.; printed in Wilkins, Concilia, III, 837.

<sup>148</sup>C.R., fol. 215v. For further episcopal executions of the instructions to enforce the injunctions, cf. Elton, P & P, p. 255.

the importance of Cranmer's position in the implementation of reform. Where all the dates are known, the speed with which the archbishop acted is impressive. Fourteen instances of the despatch of such commands are recorded.<sup>149</sup>

---

7 days or less	14 days or less	over 14 days
7	2	5

---

Table showing the interval between the despatch of  
the government's commands and the archbishop's  
execution of the same orders

Two of the returns to the crown which were performed after fourteen days were made to the court of first fruits and tenths; such returns normally took more than two weeks.<sup>150</sup>

In part, the archbishop's speed in his execution of the commands may be explained by the fact that he himself was the author of the measure. His archiepiscopal Register, therefore, shows that Cranmer was able to implement spiritual reforms in diocese and province. Cranmer had long been concerned with the compilation of articles of religion. As early as 1538, a series of thirteen articles had been issued by a group of English and Lutheran divines.<sup>151</sup> In 1553, a series of forty two Articles was distributed to the clergy.<sup>152</sup> On 19 June, the official of the court of Canterbury and dean of

---

<sup>149</sup> Cf. L.P.L., C.R., fols 18-19, 22-v., 26v.-7, 27-8, 31-2v., 48v.-9, 53, 54v., 55v.-7, 61, 65v.-6 and 215-v.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. ibid., fols 53 and 54v.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (London, 1964), p. 251.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 88A-B. The text of the Articles is to be found in P.S., Liturgies, pp. 526-37.

the arches was instructed to summon all ecclesiastics in the deanery of the arches in London to assemble before the archbishop in the hall of Lambeth Palace on 23 June to receive further instructions concerning the Articles. Nothing else survives within the Register concerning the implementation of the Articles.

Further cases survive within the Register. In August 1543, letters missive under the signet were despatched to the archbishop requesting prayers to be said throughout the province for rain to cease:

And for asmuch as there hathe ben now a late and still continuith mucche raine and other unseasonable weder wherby is lik to ensue grete hurt and damage to the corne and fructes now rype uppon the grownde...we requyre you and neverthe lesse commaunde you to send unto all your brotherne the bysshoppes wyth in your province to cause such generall rogacions and processions to be made...<sup>153</sup>

In June 1544, letters missive under the King's signet were again despatched to the archbishop. Since all Christendom was reduced to a state of war, the King had once more resolved to command that prayers be said in churches throughout the realm. In the past, people

partely for lacke of goode instruction and callinge on, partly for that they understode no parte of soche prayers or suffrages as

---

<sup>153</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 22-v.; of. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 27.

the arches was instructed to summon all ecclesiastics in the deanery of the arches in London to assemble before the archbishop in the hall of Lambeth Palace on 23 June to receive further instructions concerning the Articles. Nothing else survives within the Register concerning the implementation of the Articles.

Further cases survive within the Register. In August 1543, letters missive under the signet were despatched to the archbishop requesting prayers to be said throughout the province for rain to cease:

And for asmuch as there hathe ben now a late and still continuith mucche raine and other unseasonable weder wherby is lik to ensue grete hurt and damage to the corne and fructes now rype uppon the grownde...we requyre you and neverthe lesse commaunde you to send unto all your brotherne the bysshoppes wyth in your province to cause such generall rogacions and processions to be made...<sup>153</sup>

In June 1544, letters missive under the King's signet were again despatched to the archbishop. Since all Christendom was reduced to a state of war, the King had once more resolved to command that prayers be said in churches throughout the realm. In the past, people

partely for lacke of goode instruction and callinge on, partly for that they understode no parte of soche prayers or suffrages as

---

<sup>153</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 22-v.; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 27.

were used to be songe and sayde, have used to  
come very slackely to the procession...<sup>154</sup>

It had previously been decided, therefore, that suffrages should  
be drawn up in the 'Englyshe tonge'.<sup>155</sup> Cranmer was  
entrusted with the task of compiling such prayers. It is  
unclear if he was the actual instigator of the measure. The  
resulting English Litany was in print at least as early as  
27 May 1544.<sup>156</sup> The government's hope was that the suffrages  
were

not to be for a monethe or twoo observed and  
after slenderly considered as otheroure  
injunctions have tooure no litle mervayle  
bene used, but to...be setforthe by preachinge,  
good exhortations and otherwayes...<sup>157</sup>

Yet, in cases where the archbishop did not help to  
frame policy, the government was able nonetheless to control  
the metropolitan at Canterbury. On 30 April 1548, the council  
despatched letters missive to the archbishop concerning the  
alienation of goods from parish churches. Henceforth,  
churches should

in nowyse sell, gyve or otherwyse alienate anie  
belles or other ornament or iuell...upon  
payne of his highnes' displeasure...<sup>158</sup>

<sup>154</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 48v.-9; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 58.

<sup>155</sup> C.R., loc. cit.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. F.E. Brightman, 'The Litany under Henry VIII' in E.H.R., vol. XXIV(1909), pp. 101-4. Brightman shows that the famous letter of October [1544?] concerns not the Litany, but rather a projected reform of the Processionale.

<sup>157</sup> C.R., loc. cit.

<sup>158</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 55v.; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 67.

Cranmer despatched his mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury, although that document is undated in the Register. By April 1548, Somerset's government was in severe financial straits. It intended to alleviate its plight by appropriating church plate. Again in January 1549, Paget warned Somerset 'To geve ordre for the stave of belles, leade, and other ornamentes, and goodes of churches which the people make awaye apase'.<sup>159</sup> The same is true of the period of Northumberland's ascendancy. In a letter to Queen Mary, Cranmer portrayed Northumberland as 'seeking long time my destruction'.<sup>160</sup> There was certainly personal enmity between the two. In 1552, for example, the archbishop was criticized at court for not proceeding on a royal commission. He wrote to Cecil that

the cause of my stay in the commission...is because that all the gentlemen and justices of the peace of Kent, which be in commission with me, be now at London...<sup>161</sup>

The letter is dated 20 November. The surviving evidence of the patent rolls suggests that the terms of the commission may have been financial.<sup>162</sup> Yet it is unclear how far Cranmer was able to resist such policies. Certainly, routine administration

---

<sup>159</sup> Cf. D.E. Hoak, The King's Council in the reign of Edward VI (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 168-71. Cf. also 'The Letters of William, Lord Paget of Beaudesert, 1547-63' ed. by B.L. Beer and S.M. Jack in Camden Miscellany, vol. XXV, published by The Royal Historical Society (Camden Fourth Series, vol. 13) (London, 1974), p. 21.

<sup>160</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 440 and n. 2.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., p. 440 and n. 2.

<sup>162</sup> Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward VI [henceforth cited as C.P.R.: Edward VI] 6 vols (London, 1924-29), IV, 393-7. This is a commission, albeit undated on the roll, to stop the alienation of goods from churches.

does not seem to have been affected. In February 1553, the registry at Lambeth made a return to the court of first fruits and tenths concerning the vicarage of Linsted.<sup>163</sup> The cumulative evidence of the archbishop's Register suggests that the archbishop was able to offer little real resistance.

Throughout the period, the government was especially concerned to combat heresy. The archbishop's Register was not primarily a court book.<sup>164</sup> No records of the archbishop's audience court have been entered there.<sup>165</sup> No complete set of records concerning the archbishop's activities against heretics exists, but certain records of heresy trials conducted by Cranmer on royal commission do survive. It was important that the government should contain the spread of heretical opinions, for heresy threatened the stability of their religious policy. The King himself presided over the trial of John Lambert.<sup>166</sup> Yet Cranmer was clear on theological grounds that the crown possessed full spiritual authority in church and state.<sup>167</sup>

Rex tam in...ministros, quam in laicos infra sua regna et dominia plenissimam jurisdictionem, tam

<sup>163</sup> C.R., fol. 422v.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Registrum Matthæi Parker, diocesis Cantuariensis, transcribed by E.M. Thompson and edited by W.H. Frere, 3 vols (Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33), I, p.xiii.

<sup>165</sup> Cf. D.M. Owen, The Records of the Established Church in England (London, 1970), p. 36.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. J. Foxe, A & M, V, pp. 229-36.

<sup>167</sup> R.L.E., p. 200. For a complete discussion of Cranmer's concept of the royal supremacy, cf. Chapter 3 entitled Supremacy and Obedience: Thomas Cranmer's concept of Church and State, passim.

civilem quam ecclesiasticam. habet...

Cranmer was clear that heretics could not be tolerated within the Church, for they taught doctrines contrary to Holy Scripture.<sup>168</sup>

Following the accession of Edward VI, the archbishop's Register contains important records of his actions against heretics on royal commission.<sup>169</sup> The Treasons act of 1547 repealed all legislation concerning heresy.<sup>170</sup> The government, however, did not intend its religious policy to be challenged by religious radicals and the prosecution of Anabaptists continued. In April 1548, the archbishop and six other judges sat in the lady chapel in St Paul's, London, to try John Champneis of the parish of Stratford Bow in London diocese. Champneis abjured certain articles which he had held. He had maintained that after man is regenerate in Christ, he cannot sin for whilst the outer man might sin, the inward man could not. The gospel had been so persecuted since the time of the apostles that no man might follow it. Those regenerate in Christ do not lose godly love and cannot break Christ's commandments. It was the main tenet of 'our marked man's doctrine' to make people believe that men possessed no spirit whereby they might remain righteous in Christ. God permits his elect people to enjoy fully all worldly things. Champneis swore to reject such doctrines. The archbishop enjoined him to refrain from preaching, to procure

<sup>168</sup> Cf., for example, R.L.E., p. 8.

<sup>169</sup> For a record of Cranmer's activities during the whole of his pontificate, cf. C.R., fols 67-79.

<sup>170</sup> Stat. Realm. IV, 1, 19.



as many copies of his books as possible and to burn them and to bear his faggot at St Paul's Cross.<sup>171</sup> John Assheton believed that the Trinity was established by the Quicunque vult of Athanasius. The Holy Ghost is only a power of the Father, not God. Jesus Christ was a holy prophet who lived, hungered and thirsted. The sole result of Christ's passion was to bring men to a knowledge of God. The trial took place in December 1548 and he too was ordered to perform penance.<sup>172</sup> Michael Thombe abjured his heresies at Lambeth on 11 May 1549.<sup>173</sup> Thombe rejected his former beliefs that Christ took no flesh of Mary and that the baptism of infants is not profitable because it is performed without faith. The danger was greatest if Anabaptist tenets were held by the clergy. Champneis was described simply as a layman.<sup>174</sup> Michael Thombe was a butcher.<sup>175</sup> Assheton, however, was a parish priest from the parish of Shillington in Lincoln diocese and the acta describe him as Magister.<sup>176</sup>

Whilst Anabaptists tended to abjure under prosecution, some certainly resisted. Michael Puttoe, a tanner from Colchester, bore a faggot at St Paul's Cross on 5 May 1549.

<sup>171</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 71v.-2v; printed in Wilkins, Concilia, IV, pp. 39-40. Wriothesley's Chronicle dated Champneis' trial to 27 April 1549. Cf. C. Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England during the reigns of the Tudors from 1485 to 1559, ed. in 2 vols for The Camden Society by W.D. Hamilton (London, 1875-7), II, pp. 10-11.

<sup>172</sup> C.R., fols 73-4.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., fol. 74-v. Cf. Wriothesley, op. cit., II, pp. 12-13. The commission to Cranmer and four others is dated 12 April 1549. Cf. C.P.R.: Edward VI, II, 406.

<sup>174</sup> C.R., fols 71v.-2v.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., fol. 74-v.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., fols 73-4.

He had abjured his opinion that Christ did not descend into hell. The trial was held before Cranmer on 30 April.<sup>177</sup> On 19 May, he underwent penance for a second time.<sup>178</sup> In 1550, he was in trouble for preaching once more.<sup>179</sup> In two very important cases, the defendants did not abjure at all. Joan Bocher and George van Parris, a Dutch surgeon, were both condemned to be burned as notorious heretics in the latter half of Edward's reign.<sup>180</sup> Both trials were performed on commission from the crown.<sup>181</sup> The form of the acta was relatively simple. Parris' trial took place in an upper room at Lambeth palace on 6 April 1551. Miles Coverdale objected that Parris believed that Christ was not true God. Parris refused to abjure. The archbishop declared that he was an obstinate heretic and excommunicated him, submitting him to the secular arm for punishment. He was then surrendered to Mr Guy Wade, keeper of the Poultry Compter prison.<sup>182</sup> The signification of the sentence to the crown, with a request for punishment, condemned Parris as 'quidam iniquitatis diabolice alumnus et filius'. Bocher was tried in the lady chapel in St Paul's, London, on 31 April 1549. She believed that Christ

<sup>177</sup> Wriothesley, op. cit., II, p. 12.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>179</sup> A.P.C., III, 20.

<sup>180</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 74v.-9. Two folios are missing, for the foliation jumps from 75v.-78. Cf. D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales [henceforth cited as Smith, Registers] (London, 1981), p. 17.

<sup>181</sup> The trial of Joan Bocher was authorized by a commission dated 12 April 1549. Cf. n. 173. Parris' trial was held by virtue of an important commission dated 18 January 1551 to enforce the use of The Book of Common Prayer. Cf. C.R., fols 70v.-1; C.P.R.: Edward VI., III, 347; Wilkins, Concilia, IV, pp. 66-7.

<sup>182</sup> C.R., fols 78-9; printed in Wilkins, Concilia, IV, pp. 44-5.

did not take flesh of the Virgin. The flesh of the Virgin was the outward man born in sin, whereas the Word was made flesh by the consent of the inward man of the Virgin.<sup>183</sup> In 1547, all heresy legislation had been repealed.<sup>184</sup> The burning of Bocher and Parris, therefore, rested on the authority of common law. It was curious, however, for Anabaptists were burned for heresy in a Protestant country by the common law which was consciously derived from papal canon law.<sup>185</sup> Bocher was burned at Smithfield on 2 May 1550.<sup>186</sup> Parris was burned on 24 April 1551.<sup>187</sup> The religious settlement embodied in the acts of Uniformity of 1549 and 1552 was carefully enforced by the government.<sup>188</sup> There seems no reason to doubt Cranmer's acquiescence in that policy.

In its most passive form, the archbishop's role under the new order is to be seen in Henry VIII's use of Cranmer's powers in the complex series of marriages into which the King entered throughout his reign. Martin Luther himself became embroiled in the case of the bigamy of Philip of Hesse.<sup>189</sup> Cranmer's court of faculties issued in May 1536 a dispensation for the King to marry Jane Seymour

<sup>183</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 74v.-5v.; printed in Wilkins, *Concilia*, IV, pp. 42-4. Dr John Davis has argued that Bocher came from a Lollard background. Cf. J. Davis, 'Joan of Kent, Lollardy and the English Reformation' in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 33 no. 2 (April, 1982), pp. 225-33.

<sup>184</sup> *Stat. Realm.* IV, 1, 19.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. W. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, 17 vols (London, 1938-72), vol. I [7th ed. revised by A.L. Goodhart and H.G. Hanbury], pp. 616-18.

<sup>186</sup> Wriothesley, *op. cit.*, II, 37-8.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>188</sup> *Stat. Realm.* IV, 1, pp. 37-9 and 130-1.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. R.H. Bainton, *Here I stand* (London, 1951), pp. 373-5.

despite the fact that they were related in the third degree. They were empowered to marry in any church and in times prohibited by any clerk without the calling of banns.<sup>190</sup> Another original dispensation also survives. In July 1543, Nicholas Wotton issued a dispensation for the King to marry Catherine Parr:

...ut matrimonium inter excellentissimam regiam maiestatem vestram et dictam nobilem mulierem dominam Katherinam in quacunque ecclesia, capella sive oratorio quam sive quod vestra regia maiestas ad id eligere velit absque ulla bannorum editione per quemcumque prelatum sive presbiterum solemnizare ac solemnizari facere libere et licite valeatis...<sup>191</sup>

Cranmer owed his very elevation to the see of Canterbury in 1533 to his idiosyncratic views concerning the right of the English universities to judge the marital cause of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon.<sup>192</sup> In May 1533, he presided over a court at Dunstable which annulled the marriage. The sentence is dated 23 May.<sup>193</sup> Similarly, the archbishop was called upon to annul the marriage of the King to Anne of Cleves and the acta have been carefully entered into the archiepiscopal Register.<sup>194</sup> On 19 January 1541, both English archbishops were ordered by the privy council to retain the acta amongst

<sup>190</sup> P.R.O., E 30. 1472(1); L.P., X, 915. Dr Chambers has given some account of Cranmer's jurisdiction in Henry VIII's marital causes in D.S. Chambers, Faculty Office registers 1534-1549 (Oxford, 1966), pp. xxxiv-v.

<sup>191</sup> P.R.O., E. 30. 1472(6); L.P., XVIII, 1, 854. The original dispensation has not been noted before. Cf. Chambers, op. cit., p. xxviii.

<sup>192</sup> D.N.B., sub nomine.

<sup>193</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 243 and n. 5 and p. 244 n.

<sup>194</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 141-6v. Lee's Register at York also contains a record of the acta. Cf. B.I., Register 28, fols 142-50.

the archives of their registries.<sup>195</sup> Professor Scarisbrick has shown that the desire to split the Emperor Charles V and Francis of France led to the decision by Henry VIII and his ministers that the Tudor monarch should choose Anne of Cleves as his fourth wife.<sup>196</sup> She arrived in England on 27 December 1540.<sup>197</sup> On 6 January, she and Henry were married.<sup>198</sup> By July, the clergy of the realm were commissioned to decide whether the marriage were null and void. Despite the King's wish for Anne to enter the country, his first meeting with her was a disaster. Lord John Russell said that the King's reaction was certainly unfavourable:

...I se no such thing in her as hath been shewed me of her...and I like her not.<sup>199</sup>

On the day of the wedding itself, Cromwell was told by the King:

...if it were not to suffice the world, and my realm, I would not do that I must do this day for none earthly thing...<sup>200</sup>

The King's attempts to dissolve the union, however, were complicated by his need not to provoke hostile forces abroad.<sup>201</sup>

<sup>195</sup> Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England 10 Richard II 1386 - 33 Henry VIII 1542, edited in 7 vols by Sir H. Nicholas (London, 1834-7), vol. VII, p. 118.

<sup>196</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII (London, 1968), p. 368.

<sup>197</sup> L.P., XV, 14.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., 823.

<sup>199</sup> C.R., fol. 143; J. Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials [henceforth cited as Ecol. Mem.] 3 vols (Oxford, 1822), I, ii, 455; L.P., XV, 850(6).

<sup>200</sup> C.R., fol. 144v.; Burnet, Hist. Ref., IV, 427; L.P., XV, 823. George IV as Prince Regent uttered similar *bons mots* when he first met his bride, the disgusting Caroline of Brunswick; 'Harris, I am not well. Pray get me a glass of brandy'. Cf. C. Hibbert, George IV: Prince of Wales (Newton Abbot, 1973), p. 144.

<sup>201</sup> Cf. Scarisbrick, op. cit., p. 371.

The case was initiated by a 'spontaneous' request from parliament for the clergy of the realm to try the case.<sup>202</sup>

This took place on 6 July. On the same day, a royal commission was issued addressed to the archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons and clergy of the realm. They were to decide whether the marriage was valid and to declare their judgement.<sup>203</sup> It had once been suggested that the 'divorce' of Catherine of Aragon from Henry VIII should be tried in this way.<sup>204</sup> On Wednesday, 7 July, a large group of clerics from both convocations assembled in the chapter house of St Peter's, Westminster. There were fourteen bishops, one bishop elect, the prolocutor of the lower house of convocation of the southern province, six deans, eighteen archdeacons and a great number of clergy from both provinces. The form of the procedure was relatively simple.<sup>205</sup> The archbishop of Canterbury explained the reason for the synod and Richard Gwent presented the King's commission, sealed with the great seal. Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, explained the reasons for the invalidity of the pretended marriage. It was then decided that a quorum of fourteen men should act on behalf of the rest. The lower house of clergy then left the chapter house. It was decided that the bishops of Durham

---

<sup>202</sup> L.P., XV, 908; St. P., VIII, 404.

<sup>203</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 142; printed in Burnet, Hist. Ref., IV, pp. 431-2.

<sup>204</sup> This was suggested in The Glasse of Truthe; cf. N. Pocock, Records of the Reformation: The Divorce 1527-33, 2 vols (Oxford, 1870), II, pp. 418-19.

<sup>205</sup> C.R., fol. 141-v.

and Winchester, Richard Gwent, the bishop elect of Westminster and the dean of York should examine the witnesses. The archbishop of Canterbury then prorogued the session until 6 am and 8 am the following day. Between 1 pm and 6 pm, the men so deputed went to the King's palace at Westminster. They received thirteen depositions before the synod reconvened. On the following day, four members were added to the quorum. The bishop of Winchester produced the depositions and further public instruments. The commissioners began their deliberations. After no little time, all the bishops and the clergy entered the chapter house and the synod was prorogued until 3 pm. At that time, the synod reassembled in the chapter house and after more discussion the decision was announced.

The depositions contained three main charges. Audley, who was the lord chancellor, the archbishop of Canterbury, the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, the earl of Southampton and the bishop of Durham asserted that when Anne first arrived in England, the King delayed the proclamation of the espousals for two days in order that he might ascertain whether the matter of a precontract between Anne and the son of the duke of Lorraine had been settled.<sup>206</sup> The duke of Suffolk noted:

...in the begynnynge of the treatie of the marriage betwene the Kings Majesty and the Lady Anne of Cleves, he noted specially that the Kings Majesty constantly affirmed, how his Highnes wold do nothing therin, onely[onless] the pre-contract

<sup>206</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 142v.; Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, 452-3; L.P., XV, 850(3).

betwene the said Lady and the Marques of  
Lorraine were first clered.<sup>207</sup>

Such statements were certainly made with the benefit of  
hindsight. Professor Soarisbrick has shown how anxious the  
King was for Anne to arrive in England.<sup>208</sup> It was Cromwell  
who was blamed for allowing the matter to be passed over.<sup>209</sup>  
On 5 January, the ambassadors certified that the precontract  
was null and void. They swore that they would procure  
authentic copies of the revocation within three months.<sup>210</sup>  
When the documents arrived, it is clear that the precontract was  
considered null by Paland, marshall of Cleves, as early as  
1535.<sup>211</sup> The new documents created yet further problems.  
Following the arrival of the new evidence, Audley and the others  
declared in their depositions:

...thespousals by theym[the ambassadors] spoken  
of to have ben made long agoo, may be taken for  
espousals not only de futuro, but also de  
praesenti; which intriketh the mattier moch more,  
and doth not clere it...<sup>212</sup>

Whilst an espousal de futuro was a pre-contract which might  
be broken by renunciation, an espousal de praesenti constituted  
in effect a binding contract.<sup>213</sup> The result of this was that

<sup>207</sup> C.R., loc. cit.; cf. Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, p. 453;  
L.P., XV, 850(4).

<sup>208</sup> Cf. Soarisbrick, op. cit., pp. 373-5.

<sup>209</sup> C.R., fols 142v.-3; Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, 453-5;  
L.P., XV, 850(4) and (5).

<sup>210</sup> C.R., fols 145-v.; L.P., XV, 861(2.1).

<sup>211</sup> C.R., fol. 146; L.P., XV, 861(2.111).

<sup>212</sup> C.R., fol. 142v.; Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, 452-3; L.P.,  
XV, 850(3).

<sup>213</sup> C.N.L. Brooke, Marriage in Christian History (An Inaugural  
Lecture as Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, University  
of Cambridge in 1977) (Cambridge, 1978), p. 23.



'...the condition of the clerking thereof[of the King's marriage], put always therunto by the Kings Majesty' was 'not to be fulfilled in any wise by them that so promised'.<sup>214</sup>

The remaining assertions were equally difficult to prove. The King's defence, however, stressed two further points. It was alleged that the marriage had never been consummated. Much of the medical evidence proffered by Dr Chambre<sup>215</sup> and Dr Buttes<sup>216</sup> was concerned with the allegation. It was stressed that the King's will to contract the marriage was also insufficient. The King maintained: '...I never for love to the woman consented to marry'.<sup>217</sup> Sir Anthony Browne maintained that '...by sundry the Kings Highnes behaviours before and after the marriage, he[Browne] judgeth in his conscience that the King did never in his hart favour the lady to mary her, if outward respects had not enforced him to that act'.<sup>218</sup>

At 3 pm on Thursday, 8 July, the synod met to announce the result of its investigation. After some discussion, they unanimously agreed that the King was in no way bound by the pretended marriage with Anne. Letters testimonial

<sup>214</sup> C.R., fol. 142v.; Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, 452-3; L.P., XV, 850(3).

<sup>215</sup> C.R., fols 143v.-4; Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, 460-1; L.P., XV, 850(12).

<sup>216</sup> C.R., fol. 144; Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, 461-2; L.P., XV, 850(13).

<sup>217</sup> C.R., fol. 145; Burnet, Hist. Ref., IV, 430; L.P., XV, 825.

<sup>218</sup> C.R., fol. 143v.; Strype, Ecol. Mem., I, ii, 458; L.P., XV, 850(7). Cf. also J.T. Noonan, 'Marital affection in the canonists' in Studia Gratiana, vol. XII, pp. 481-509.

were ordered to be drawn up and the archbishop prorogued the synod until 8 am the next day. On that following day, discussion continued and the session was prorogued until 3 pm. At that time, the synod again reassembled. After further discussion, letters testimonial were drawn up and sealed with the seals of the two archbishops.<sup>219</sup> The resulting instrument was signed by twenty bishops, forty-three deans and archdeacons, eighty-two churchmen and fourteen remaining clerics. In all, this amounted to 159 signatures.<sup>220</sup> It took the synod two days to issue their sentence, which recited the three points made at greater length in the depositions of the witnesses. They concluded:

...diffinimus maiestatem vestram predicto  
matrimonio pretenso ut pote nullo et invalido  
non alligari sed alio desuper iudicio non  
expectato ecclesie sue auctoritate fretam  
posse arbitrio suo ad contrahendum et  
consummandum matrimonium cum quavis femina  
divino iure vobiscum matrimonium contrahere  
non prohibita procedere, pretenso illo cum  
domina Anna predicta matrimonio non obstante.<sup>221</sup>

The sentence was confirmed by act of parliament.<sup>222</sup> Such was the power of Henry VIII in the church over which he presided as supreme head. The synod was merely to effect what the King desired.

<sup>219</sup> C.R., fol. 141v.

<sup>220</sup> Ibid., fols 141v.-2v. The text in archbishop Thomas Cranmer's Register omits the lists of signatories; cf. Burnet, Hist. Ref., IV, 436-9.

<sup>221</sup> B.L., Cotton Charter X, 13. The document, dated 9 July 1540, is a notification to the crown of the synod's sentence. It bears the signatures and seals of the archbishops of Canterbury and York alone.

<sup>222</sup> Stat. Realm., III, 781-3.

Throughout the twenty years of Cranmer's archiepiscopate, the government was at pains to use the powers of that prelate to forward its political and religious policies. Throughout the 1530s, the reality of Thomas Cromwell's role as Vice-Gerent eclipsed that of Thomas Cranmer as principal minister of the King's spiritual jurisdiction. The government used its powers of visitation to establish a new relationship with the English episcopate. Following the issue of a commission to him in October 1535, Cranmer possessed jurisdiction as the King's servant and at his pleasure only. In the years after 1535, the government continued to use the archbishop's powers as metropolitan to enforce its policies within the kingdom. Yet, the archbishop was also able to use his position to implement his own programme of reform. The distribution of the Articles of Religion in 1553 forms a useful example of such a concept. In the divorce of Henry VIII from Anne of Cleves, however, the nature of Cranmer's position is to be seen at its starkest. Yet, the archbishop continued to believe throughout his pontificate that the King was 'God's anointed...in consideration of [his] power which is ordained' for Princes were 'elected by God' alone.<sup>223</sup>

---

<sup>223</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 126.

Supremacy and Obedience: Thomas Cranmer's concept of Church and State.

Roman Catholicism, the Prince Regent is reported to have said in 1800, is 'the only religion for a gentleman'.<sup>1</sup> Here, indeed, was a man of discernment for he had declared that the espousal of the Roman Catholic religion was an attainment to which any man might aspire. What a pronouncement for a future supreme governor of the church of England by law established! Some four hundred years earlier, an obscure Cambridge don faced the same question concerning obedience in Church and State.

The two texts which are traditionally cited to support the view that by the time of Cranmer's consecration in 1533 he had come to reject the supremacy of the Roman Church leave considerable scope for speculation. In a letter to King Henry VIII, Cranmer said that in 1535 he had preached a sermon in which he revealed: 'I said that these many years I had daily prayed unto God that I might see the power of Rome destroyed'.<sup>2</sup> In 1543, the archbishop was threatened by devious machinations among the prebendaries of his own cathedral church at Canterbury. During the ensuing investigations, one Burgrave who was a bricklayer, maintained:

...my lord of Canterbury preached like a  
worshipful prelate that prayed 7 years before

---

<sup>1</sup>The Diaries of Sylvester Douglas, Lord Glenbervie, edited in 2 vols by F. Bickley (London, 1928), vol. II, p. 121.

<sup>2</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 327.

the Bishop of Rome fell that the said Bishop might be expelled this realm.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, the keynote of all attempts by modern scholarship to understand the archbishop's doctrinal position in 1533 has been speculation.<sup>4</sup> In his Commonplaces from the canon law, important new light is shed upon the archbishop's ideas.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> L.P., XVIII, 11(1543), no. 546(section VI, paragraph xxviii) [p. 303]. Burgrave also maintained that '...20 in Canterbury would say as much as he had said'; cf. ibid. Their evidence would suggest that Cranmer fully rejected papal supremacy in the year 1526.

<sup>4</sup> Mr Theodore Maynard has maintained: 'Strictly speaking, Thomas Cranmer may have inclined towards heresy at the time he became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1533, but he was not really a heretic...except for his rejection of the Pope's Supremacy'; cf. T. Maynard, The Life of Thomas Cranmer(London, 1956), p. 100. The archbishop's latest biographer, Mr Jasper Ridley, is reluctant to accept that Cranmer embraced this opinion whilst he was still at Cambridge: 'Nor is there any reason to believe that Cranmer held any strong views at this time about Papal supremacy'; cf. J. Ridley, Thomas Cranmer(Oxford, 1962), p. 21. Mr Ridley maintains that of all the doctrines which Cranmer came to embrace in later life, '...there is only one which can clearly be traced back to his Cambridge days'. On the question of the superiority of Holy Scripture 'Cranmer was indeed an old truant'; cf. ibid., p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> L.P.L., MS. 1107, fols 1-80. The source has been curiously neglected by many of those engaged in Cranmer Studies. It was certainly known to Jenkyns, who printed a summary of its contents in the first collected edition of Thomas Cranmer's Works. Cf. The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury, edited in 4 vols by H. Jenkyns(Oxford, 1833), vol. II, pp. 1-10. Mason simply noted the existence of the legal Commonplaces in a footnote. He supposed that the summary collection of extracts drawn up by the archbishop was Cranmer's sole contribution on the matter. Pollard seemed to think the same. Cf. A.J. Mason, Thomas Cranmer(London, 1898), p. 84 n. 1 and A.F. Pollard, Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation 1489-1556, new ed.(London, 1926), p. 281 and n. 1. Mr Jasper Ridley seems to omit references to them altogether, since the MS. does not appear in his bibliography. Cf. Ridley, op. cit., pp. 412-32. The summary of the contents which the archbishop drew up from his larger collection of legal commonplaces may have been intended for debates in Parliament; their date is unclear. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 68-75. Pollard maintained that this summary was of little constructive use. Cf. Pollard, op. cit., p. 281. The legal Commonplace book

The dating of this collection presents great difficulties. The compilation itself has been made onto three separate kinds of paper. The completed collection forms 76 folios and comprises the first part of the present Lambeth Palace MS. 1107. Only one of the watermarks in the paper can be dated with certainty. The sign is apparently the mark of a maker in eastern Normandy near Evreux. Briquet shows that such paper was in use at Harcourt in Normandy in 1531.<sup>6</sup> The title on the front cover of the compilation is 'Bishop Cranmer's Collections of Lawe'. In their present form, they cannot date before the archbishop's consecration in 1533 for they are not in Cranmer's own hand, but in the hands of secretaries. By 1535, the collection was substantially complete for the archbishop used the contents of the compilation in sermons preached at Canterbury:

...I spake against the bishop of Rome his laws;  
which he calleth "divinas leges" and "sacros  
canones" and maketh them equal with God's  
law. And here I declared that many of  
his laws were contrary to God's law.<sup>7</sup>

The evidence of the manuscript seems to indicate that it was assembled in stages. Distinctions 28, 34 and 38 of Gratian's

---

was edited for the first time in the nineteenth century. Cf. Strype, Cranmer, vol. III Appendix and Addenda[henceforth cited as A & A], pp. 744-871.

<sup>6</sup> The mark appears in L.P.L., MS. 1107, fols 1, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32, 36, 37, 38, 49, 74, 75. Cf. C.M. Briquet, Les Filigranes, 4 vols (Amsterdam, 1968), vol. I, p. \*70. II, p. 573; IV, no. 11344.

<sup>7</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 326. The sermons were in response to a mandate from the King dated 3 June 1535. Cranmer told the King that he preached sermons in Canterbury before Richard Leighton, the King's visitor. Leighton's itinerary shows that he was in Canterbury in the autumn of 1535. Cf. L.P., VI, 350 and 444.

Decretum are represented by the chapters Consulendum, Lector, Ignorantia, Si in laicis and Sedulo. Directions to the scribe to copy these chapters are entered into the margin of the manuscript.<sup>8</sup> The way in which the separate quires are made of different sorts of paper supports such a view. The first quire consists of paper with two different watermarks.<sup>9</sup> In its present form, therefore, the compilation probably dates from the years 1533-35.

Within the text of the legal Commonplaces, Holy Scripture is the mirror against which all practices are to be judged. In a discussion of the role of the Church in the legal Commonplaces, Cranmer examined the claim of the Roman canon law which laid down: 'In domibus tamen ab episcopis sive presbiteris oblationes celebrari nullatenus licet'. Rejecting the concept, Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript 'Torquet scripturam'.<sup>10</sup> Yet, the extracts are not made in a spirit of enquiry, but stem from convictions already formed. Against many of the extracts in the manuscript, the Latin word 'error' has been written.<sup>11</sup> A scribe has later erased the word and inserted the substance of the archbishop's complaint. Such evidence seems to suggest that by 1533, Thomas

<sup>8</sup> L.P.L., MS. 1107, fol. 6v.

<sup>9</sup> The collation of this section of the MS. is: 1<sup>8</sup>-4<sup>8</sup>; 5<sup>9</sup>-6<sup>9</sup>; 7<sup>8</sup>-8<sup>8</sup>;  
<sup>10</sup> Originally, the compilation formed two distinct collections. The quire marks on the first folio of each quire run a: fol. 1; b: fol. 9; c: fol. 16; d: fol. 24; e: fol. 32; a: fol. 41; b: fol. 50; c: fol. 58; d: fol. 66.

<sup>10</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 811.

<sup>11</sup> Cf., for example, L.P.L., MS. 1107, fol. 37v. The occurrence of the word 'error' is not noted in the printed text of the code.

Cranmer had come to embrace the Scriptural principles upon which the compilation is founded.

In 1529, Thomas Cranmer first came to the attention of the Tudor Court with advanced ideas about the King's divorce. Ralph Morice, the archbishop's secretary, compiled 'A declaration' concerning the life of his master. According to Morice, Cranmer insisted that the divorce was not a matter for canon lawyers, but for theologians.<sup>12</sup> Morice's statement supports the assertions of the author of an anonymous memoir of the archbishop which was compiled shortly after the archbishop's death. The author asserted that whilst at Cambridge, Cranmer applied himself for three years to the study of Holy Scripture.<sup>13</sup> Such a concept gains further support from the archbishop's own writings. The Articuli Duodecim concerning the King's divorce were composed about the year 1530. Basing his arguments squarely upon Holy Scripture, Thomas Cranmer concluded that the King's marriage to Catherine of Aragon was invalid 'lege divina et naturali prohibente, nullum omnino fuisse, neque esse posse censemus'.<sup>14</sup> It was not simply a matter of Pentateuchal teaching on marriage. Cranmer had clearly begun to consider the position of the papacy too. In a letter to the earl of Wiltshire in 1531, Thomas Cranmer gave further evidence of his rejection of Roman canon

<sup>12</sup> Narratives of the days of the Reformation, edited for the Camden Society by J.G. Nichols (London, 1859), pp. 241-2.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 219.

<sup>14</sup> N. Pocock, Records of the Reformation: The Divorce 1527-1533. 2 vols (Oxford, 1870), I, p. 399. He claimed that the article was plainly true 'inconcusso divinae legis fundamento'. Cf. ibid.



law. Reginald Pole had written a book concerning the King's divorce. Cranmer wrote:

The principal intent whereof is, that the king his grace should be content to commit his great cause to the judgment of the pope: wherein meseemeth he lacketh much judgment.<sup>15</sup>

It is, perhaps, in relation to the archbishop's Scriptural study that in 1533 the author of the anonymous memoir of the archbishop could call the legal Commonplace Book 'old collections'.<sup>16</sup> In its present form, the book dates from the opening years of Cranmer's pontificate. Yet the Scriptural study upon which it is founded does seem to date from the years of Cranmer's sojourn in Cambridge.

The principle which lies behind Cranmer's denunciation of the papacy in the Commonplaces is that the see of Rome has claimed for itself the position due to the Word of God in Holy Scripture:

Sic omnes sanctiones apostolicae sedis accipiendae sunt, tanquam ipsius divina voce Petri firmatae.<sup>17</sup>

In a letter to Queen Mary shortly before his death, Cranmer made a similar point. The Pope<sup>18</sup>

subverteth...the laws of God: so that whosoever be under his authority, he suffereth

<sup>15</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 229.

<sup>16</sup>Narratives of the days of the Reformation, edited for The Camden Society by J.G. Nichols (London, 1859), p. 221.

<sup>17</sup>Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 751: Sic omnes. In the manuscript of the legal Commonplaces, many of the phrases are underlined. Such annotations are henceforth noted in the footnotes; 'Sic...firmatae' underlined in MS.

<sup>18</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 449.

them not to be under Christ's religion purely,  
as Christ did command.

Cranmer developed his argument against papal power on two fronts. The institution itself was seen to be contrary to divine law. He was outraged by the pretensions of the Roman Church:

Papa, id est admirabilis...quia vires Dei in  
terris gerit...nec Deus es nec homo, quasi  
neuter est inter utrumque.<sup>19</sup>

Not only was the see of Rome itself seen to be in error, but also the whole code of papal constitutions. Cranmer rejected any notion of a code based upon human authority. He noted in the margin of the manuscript the tenor of the canon law which maintained:

Nullae leges valeat[sic], quas statuunt  
aliqui contra Romanorum pontificum  
constitutiones.<sup>20</sup>

The promulgator of the canons was not bound by them; Cranmer noted that 'Roma. Pon. non ligatur canonibus'.<sup>21</sup> Should anyone fail to accept such ideas:

...neither availeth them the catholic faith,  
nor the four evangelists; but they  
blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and shall have no  
forgiveness.<sup>22</sup>

Cranmer certainly rejected the idea that Christ in Holy Scripture endowed the see of Rome with universal jurisdiction and with powers to bind and loose. In a letter

<sup>19</sup>Strype, Cranmer. III A & A, p. 820.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 809: Omne quod.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.: Ideo.

<sup>22</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 68-9.

to Queen Mary in 1555, he stated that in the time of St Gregory, John the patriarch of Constantinople claimed superiority over other bishops. Gregory wrote that John thereby did his brethren a disservice since the bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch also presided over patriarchal sees.<sup>23</sup> The inference is obvious, but Cranmer had already achieved a mature understanding of the question in his legal Commonplaces. Here, he rejected the interpretation of the canons which laid down:

Sacrosancta Ro. et apostolica ecclesia non ab apostolis, sed ab ipso Domino salvatore nostro, primum obtinuit, sicut beato Petro Apostolo dixit: Tu es Petrus...usque soluta in coelo...<sup>24</sup>

In his later summary of the doctrines to be found in the legal code, he ridiculed the pretensions of the see of Rome 'ordained by God to have primacy over all the world' and whose bishop 'may open and shut heaven unto men'.<sup>25</sup>

One of the fiercest criticisms which Cranmer made stemmed from the papacy's control over indulgences, a protest which was surely prompted by the concern of Martin Luther himself. Cranmer rejected any notion that indulgences might be granted by the Holy See:

Romanus pontifex habet auctoritatem

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., pp. 451-2.

<sup>24</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 755: Sacrosancta; 'Sacrosancta ...obtinuit' underlined in MS.; cf. Enim vero; Quamvis; Rogamus; Sacrosancte; Fundamenta; printed in ibid., pp. 752, 754, 807-8, 820 and 823-4.

<sup>25</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 68 and 70.

concedendi indulgentias.<sup>26</sup>

He did not believe that papal indulgences could lessen the time which was to be spent in purgatory by each sinner and rejected the tenor of the canon law which claimed:

...cum dedicatur basilica, non extendatur indulgentia ultra annum, sive ab uno solo sive a pluribus episcopis dedicetur, ac deinde in anniversario dedicationis tempore xl dies de injunctis poenitentiis indulta remissio non excedat.<sup>27</sup>

The basis of Cranmer's protest lay in his conviction that sin could not be remitted by human authority. Clement V had decreed the observance of a festival which carried an indulgence of between forty and one hundred days. Noting that the festival carried remission of sins, Cranmer rejected the idea and noted in the margin of the manuscript 'Peccatum deletur propter celebrationem festi'.<sup>28</sup> In 1300, Boniface VIII decreed that a Jubilee should be celebrated for one year after the feast of the Nativity and each one hundred years thereafter. For those visiting Roman churches, a plenary indulgence was decreed. Inhabitants were to visit the basilicas for thirty days, visitors to Rome for only fifteen. The indulgence was granted 'non solum plenam et

<sup>26</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 853: Si Dominum.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 864: Cum ex.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 853: Si Dominum.

largiorem, immo plenissimam omnium suorum...veniam peccatorum'.<sup>29</sup>

Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript 'Jubileus delet peccatum annus'.<sup>30</sup> In 1343, Clement VI issued the bull Unigenitus Dei Filius which made important claims for the practice of granting papal indulgences. Cranmer noted that from 1350, the Pope reduced the interval between the Jubilees to fifty years in order to make the plenary indulgence more accessible.<sup>31</sup> Similarly, Paul II decreed that a Jubilee should be held every twenty-five years from 1474. This was confirmed by Sixtus IV, who suspended lesser indulgences at his pleasure. Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript, 'Renovat omnes priores indulgentias'.<sup>32</sup> Clearly, Cranmer had to record his views on current orthodoxy. In 1537, he gave positive expression to his views. In his Annotations to the Bishops' Book, he maintained that the 'right Christian faith' was characterized by the belief that man's sins 'by Christ's redemption be pardoned and forgiven'.<sup>33</sup>

The papacy's control over the Councils of the Church was severely censured. The Decretum of Gratian laid down that Councils might not be summoned without the authority of the Holy See. 'Synodum episcoporum absque huius Romanae auctoritate...non potestis regulariter facere'. Cranmer

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 865: Antiquorum habet; 'immo...peccatorum' underlined in MS.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., pp. 865-6: Unigenitus Dei Filius.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 868: Quemadmodum operosi.

<sup>33</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 85. Cf. ibid., p. 74.

rejected the tenet and noted in the margin 'Absque autoritate Romani pont: non potest fieri synodus Episcoporum'.<sup>34</sup>

Similarly, canon law laid down that a Council might not judge the Holy See. Cranmer rejected the idea and noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'Consilium papam judicare non potest'.<sup>35</sup> In his later summary of tenets from the canon law, Cranmer noted that the code stipulated: 'There can be no council of bishops without the authority of the see of Rome'.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, decisions of Councils must be ratified by the Holy See: 'Majores et difficiliore quaestiones ut sancta synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigit, ad sedem semper referantur apostolicam'.<sup>37</sup> Cranmer noted the ideas, only to reject them. In his summary of tenets from the legal code, he objected: 'The bishop of Rome hath authority...to discern the articles of faith, and that without any council'.<sup>38</sup>

Canon law stipulated that decisions of Councils, which are not assembled at the behest of the Holy See, have no authority: 'Constitutiones contra canones et decreta Praesulum Romanorum, vel bonos mores, nullius sunt momenti'.<sup>39</sup> Their articles were to be of no effect.<sup>40</sup> Cranmer rejected such a position. The tenor of the law maintained that if a Council

<sup>34</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 747: Synodum: 'Synodum...facere' underlined in MS.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 780: Nemo.

<sup>36</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 70.

<sup>37</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 748: Multis: 'Majores...sancta' and 'ad...apostolicam' underlined in MS.

<sup>38</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 69.

<sup>39</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 746: Constitutiones: 'Constitutiones...momenti' underlined in MS.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 748: Concilia.

condemned certain offenders, the Holy See might annul the sentence. It might also condemn offenders without recourse to a Council:

apostolica sedes sine ulla synodo praecedente  
et solvendi quos synodus inique damnaverat,  
et damnandi, nulla existente, quos oportuit  
habuerit facultatem.<sup>41</sup>

Cranmer rejected such ideas and condemned the notion that a Council might not appeal against the Pope's decision. In his later summary, the archbishop noted that 'no man hath authority to judge him, nor to meddle with any thing that he hath judged'.<sup>42</sup>

The papal constitutions governing devotional practices were criticized by the archbishop in his legal Commonplaces. He rejected the tenor of the canon law which maintained that church coverings might not be put to other uses. He noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'Ligna ecclesiae non possunt [ad] opus prophanum accomodari'.<sup>43</sup> He made special note of the rules governing the materials used in the construction of patens and chalices. Boniface noted that wooden vessels should be used. Urban laid down that such vessels should be made of silver. Canon law did not allow the use of wood. Cranmer noted with alarm 'Crevit decus ecclesiae'.<sup>44</sup> Cranmer believed that it was the Church's

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 781: Cuncta; 'apostolica...facultatem' underlined in MS.

<sup>42</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 69.

<sup>43</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 813: Ligna Ecc; with ad omitted in MS.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.: Vasa in.



task to sell earthly treasures and noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'calices ecclesiae vendi possunt pro necessitate pauperum'. The 'verus ornatus ecclesiae' was to be found in the aspirations of St Ambrose:

Aurum sacramenta non quaerent; neque auro placent que auro non emuntur. Ornatus sacrorum redemptio captivorum est, et vere illa sunt vasa pretiosa, quae redimunt animas a morte. Ille verus thesaurus est Domini, qui operatur quod sanguis eius operatus est.<sup>45</sup>

Clearly, the concept was carefully linked to Cranmer's understanding of the doctrine of justificatio sola fide.

Cranmer's reforming insights also embraced the papal constitutions enjoining fasting. The Decretum of Gratian laid down that there were to be four main periods of fasting throughout the year, just as there were four seasons.<sup>46</sup>

Noting the tenets of canon law, Cranmer saw that elsewhere the four main periods of fasting were linked to the liturgical year.<sup>47</sup> He rejected the detailed regulations concerning the times when such fasts might be held.<sup>48</sup> There were detailed regulations governing the weekly fasts and those in preparation for festivals of saints.<sup>49</sup> There was to be no violation of fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays: 'quia quarta feria Judas traditionem Domini cogitavit, sexta feria crucifixus est Salvator'.<sup>50</sup> He noted too the divergent traditions concerning

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 796-7: Aurum; 'Aurum...est' underlined in MS.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 763: Jejunium.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 764-5: Statuimus, Igitur, Hujus.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 764: De jejunio.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 815-17 and 854-5: De esu, Sabbato, Ex parte, Consilium.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 817: Jejunia; 'quia...Salvator' underlined in MS.



the rules for fasting on Sundays: 'Sabbato vero jejunandum esse, ratio evidentissima demonstrat'. 'Jejunium dominici diei... nemo celebrare debet'.<sup>51</sup> All such practices were rejected by Cranmer as superstitious, for he saw that Holy Scripture demanded a more spiritual religion.

Monasticism, itself a prominent feature of the life of the mediaeval Church, was bitterly criticized. Cranmer rejected the idea that monastic communities should be separated from local communities: 'Quia sicut piscis sine aqua caret vita, ita sine monasterio monachus'. He might not 'poenitentiam dare, neque filium de baptismo accipere, neque baptizare, neque infirmum visitare, neque mortuum sepelire, neque ad ecclesiam saecularem transire'. Cranmer rejected such papal constitutions and made his own note of the tenor of the Roman law: 'Monachum de monasterio exire non licet'.<sup>52</sup> Nevertheless, he noted the contradictions in the legal code, which also laid down conditions by which monks might assume parochial duties.<sup>53</sup> Monastic life was characterized by a vow of celibacy which all were to swear.<sup>54</sup> Nevertheless, Cranmer noted that the Popes themselves sanctioned the breaking of that vow. Notwithstanding a vow of chastity, a man may take a wife and swear an oath never to leave her. Although the

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., pp. 816-17: Sabbato; Jejunium; 'Jejunium...debet' underlined in MS.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., pp. 799-800: Placuit; 'Quia...monachus' underlined in MS.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 800: Adjicimus.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 858: Non.

second oath was illegal, the papal code sanctioned that it might be observed. Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript 'Matrimonium contractum post votum est servandum'.<sup>55</sup> Similarly, the archbishop ridiculed the monastic rules concerning abstinence from eating meat.<sup>56</sup> Rules for founding monasteries were also criticized.<sup>57</sup> At the heart of Cranmer's rejection of the monastic ideal lay the conviction that monks were devoted to attaining salvation by works:

AEgyptiorum monasteria hunc morem tenent,  
ut nullum absque operis labore suscipiant,  
non tam propter victus necessitatem quam  
propter animae salutem...<sup>58</sup>

Similarly, he rejected any concept that gifts to monasteries might confer remission of sins.<sup>59</sup> It is clear that Cranmer's insights did not allow such ideas to be consonant with his concept of verbum Dei.

The Pope's jurisdiction in temporal matters was bitterly criticized. In civil matters, Cranmer was clear that the Pope should possess no authority. Roman canon law laid down that temporal power within the city of Rome was bestowed upon the Roman primate by Constantine himself:

decernens in ipsa urbe utriusque potestatis

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 803: Innocens.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., p. 818: Carnem.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., pp. 848-9: Nos.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 819: Nunquam; 'AEgyptiorum...suscipiant' underlined in MS.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., pp. 820-1: Ex litteris.

monarchiam Romanis Pontificibus...non iustum arbitrans, ut ubi sacerdotii principatum et Christianae religionis caput imperator coelestis instituit, illic imperator terrenus habeat potestatem.<sup>60</sup>

Consequently, the bishop of Rome was responsible for all appointments within the city:

To be senator, captain, patrician, governor or officer of Rome, none shall be elected or pointed without the express licence and special consent of the see of Rome.

The penalty for infringing such an edict was to be excommunication.<sup>61</sup>

In his legal Commonplace Book, Cranmer wrote in the margin of

the manuscript: 'Ad regimen urbis nemo eligatur, sine Romani Pontificis licentia speciali'.<sup>62</sup>

Similarly, the Pope might enforce the restoration of a marriage dowry.<sup>63</sup>

He might issue orders to legitimize bastard children.<sup>64</sup>

By the terms of the canon law, Cranmer noted that 'it belongeth also to him[the Pope] to appoint and command peace and truce to be observed and kept, or not'.<sup>65</sup>

In his legal Commonplace Book, Cranmer noted with concern in the margin of the manuscript 'Romani

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 824: Fundamenta: 'decernens...potestatem' underlined in MS.

<sup>61</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 70. Cf. Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 823-6: Fundamenta.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., p. 825.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., p. 861: De Pru. Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript 'Romani Pontificis est iudex de dote'; the printed version of the code renders this as 'Romani Pontificis est iudex rerum temporalium'.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., pp. 860-1: Per vene.

<sup>65</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 71.

Pontificis interest servari treugas'.<sup>66</sup> The Scriptural basis for the exercise of such jurisdiction is set out in the canons:

Paulus etiam ut plenitudinem potestatis exponeret.  
ad Corinthos scribens ait; Nescitis. quoniam  
angelos judicabitis. quanto magis saecularia.<sup>67</sup>

Cranmer's rule of Scriptural exegesis led him to reject such a claim. The Pope's ability to act as arbitrator in civil matters was carefully noted. Civil matters might be heard by the Pope at the request of one of the parties. Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript the tenor of the Roman code 'Romanus Pontifex est iudex de rebus civilibus inter quoscunque. si altera pars illius iudicium eligat'.<sup>68</sup> In civil cases where justice is seen to be lacking, the cause might be heard by the Pope.<sup>69</sup> Such powers, however, were disputed. The Roman canons themselves acknowledged that the Pope possessed no power over civil matters, whilst others maintained that the Holy See possessed such power only in matters which touched the soul. Cranmer noted the existence of a third set of canons which held that the Pope might annul all civil laws. Rejecting such ideas as unscriptural, Cranmer noted in the manuscript 'Papa tollit omnes leges'.<sup>70</sup>

The Holy See's powers over matters of heresy are

<sup>66</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 832: Treugas.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., pp. 860-1: Per vene; 'Nescitis...saecularia' underlined in MS.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., p. 833: Novit.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., p. 836: Ex tenore.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., p. 871: Possessor.

fiercely criticized. In his later summary of the tenets of the canon law, Cranmer noted that the refusal by any man to accept the Roman canons incurred the penalties due to heresy. Rejecting the idea, Cranmer made a careful note of the pretensions of the bishop of Rome:

He that knowledgeth not himself to be under the bishop of Rome, and that the bishop of Rome is ordained by God to have primacy over all the world, is an heretio, and cannot be saved, nor is not of the flock of Christ.<sup>71</sup>

Such an idea was firmly based on insights gleaned from his study of Roman canon law in the earlier legal Commonplaces.<sup>72</sup> He also rejected the tenor of the law which claimed for the Church of Rome 'cujus et fides nullam haeresim fovet unquam. Sed quidem omnes haereseos destruit'.<sup>73</sup> Consequently, the bishop of Rome might not dictate who should be arrested for heresy. Cranmer rejected the tenor of the canon law by noting in the margin of the manuscript:

Romanus Pontifex concedit facultatem arrestandi, tute custodiendi et in compedibus ac manicis ferreis ponendi.<sup>74</sup>

He reserved for special comment the canon which laid down that sacramental doctrines should be defined by the Holy See:

Universos, qui de Sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel

<sup>71</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 68. In 1549, he made the same point in his reply to the rebels of Devonshire. Cf. ibid., p. 165.

<sup>72</sup>Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 830-2: Solitae. Unam Sanctam.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 806: Memor sum: 'cujus...unquam' underlined in MS.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., pp. 863-4: Multorum.

de baptisate...vel reliquis ecclesiasticis sacramentis, aliter sentire aut docere non metuunt, quam sacrosancta Ro. ecc... vinculo perpetui anathematis innodamus.<sup>75</sup>

Cranmer seems to have felt that the see of Rome had set itself up against the Word of God. Canon law laid down that it was heresy to question any of the papal canons. Should any man not receive them

...neither avaieth them the catholic faith, nor the four evangelists; but they blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and shall have no forgiveness.<sup>76</sup>

Papal constitutions concerning the administration of parochial benefices and diocesan sees were criticized. Canon law laid down that 'The collation of all spiritual promotions appertain[sic] to the bishop of Rome'.<sup>77</sup> In a letter to Queen Mary he made the same point:

...the pope by his laws may give all bishopricks and benefices spiritual, which by the laws of the realm can be given but only by the king and other patrons of the same...<sup>78</sup>

Cranmer also rejected the idea that 'The bishop of Rome may unite bishopricks together...at his pleasure'.<sup>79</sup> The canon Sicut unire drew extended comment from Cranmer. He rejected the idea that the Pope alone could restore those bishops who were deposed. Canon law laid down that the Pope might also

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 862: Ad abo.

<sup>76</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 68-9. In 1549, he wrote to the rebels of Devon and made the same point. Canon law laid down: '...whosoever receiveth not the laws of the bishop of Rome, avaieth neither him the catholic faith, nor the four evangelists'. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 165.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 448.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

depose bishops and divide bishoprics in two. He could transfer an episcopal seat from one place to another and replace bishops. Cranmer rejected all such ideas and noted a verse in his legal Commonplaces:

RESTITUIT PAPA, SOLUS DEONIT ET IPSE.

DIVIDIT AC UNIT, EXIMIT ATQUE PROBAT...

TRANSFERT ET MUTAT, APPELLAT NULLUS AB IPSO.<sup>80</sup>

In the margin of the manuscript, Cranmer wrote with concern:

'Romanus Pon. episcopatus unit, et alterum alteri subicit'.<sup>81</sup>

Simony and plurality are criticized. Cranmer noted that the canon law itself censured prebendaries who possessed two or three livings. Since they were non-resident, this constituted 'certum...periculum animorum'.<sup>82</sup>

He rejected the idea that prebendaries might appoint a vicar who took a portion of the fruits of the church to support himself.<sup>83</sup> Simony was

also condemned. Cranmer noted that the Roman code itself did not allow the practice. The canons stated that a practice had arisen 'ita, ut pro episcopis vel abbatibus seu quibuscunque personis ecclesiasticis ponendis in sedem, sive introducendis presbiteris in ecclesiam...aliquid requiratur'.<sup>84</sup>

One of the fiercest criticisms which Cranmer made over papal control of the ecclesiastical hierarchy concerns the function of the clergy as pastors. In his summary of the tenets of the Roman law, Cranmer wrote: 'The clergy to the relief of any common necessity can nothing confer without the

<sup>80</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 864: Sicut unire.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., p. 846: Quia in.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., pp. 847-8: Extirpan.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., pp. 861-2: Cum in: 'ita...ecclesiam' underlined in MS.

consent of the bishop of Rome'.<sup>85</sup> Canon law insisted that it was not lawful 'for the bishop of Rome to alienate or mortgage any lands of the church for any manner of necessity, except it be houses in cities, which be very chargeable to support and maintain'.<sup>86</sup> Yet, Cranmer believed that the goods of the Church should be given to support the poor. In noting the contradictions of the canon law, Cranmer stressed that the Roman code itself prescribed that clerics should embrace the ideal of charity:

Generaliter etiam pauperibus et his qui  
suis manibus laborare non possunt, episcopus  
necessaria provideat.<sup>87</sup>

Not only could the precious vessels used for Mass and vestments be sold,<sup>88</sup> but all the goods of the Church were to be used for the benefit of the poor. He himself noted in the margin of his legal Commonplace Book: 'Bona ecclesiae sunt bona pauperum'.<sup>89</sup>

One of the greatest abuses to which Cranmer objected was the complex collection of rules governing ecclesiastical trials. Canon law laid down that no-one possessed the authority to judge the bishop of Rome.<sup>90</sup> In his legal Commonplaces, Cranmer himself noted 'Papa...a nemine debet

<sup>85</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 72. In his reply to the Devonshire rebels in 1549, he made the same point; cf. ibid., p. 167. In his legal Commonplaces, Cranmer wrote in the margin the tenor of the law: 'Clerici ad sublevandas communes utilitates et necessitates nihil conferre possunt sine Romani Pontificis consensu'. Cf. Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 855: Non minus.

<sup>86</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 73; cf. Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 792-3: Non licet.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., pp. 765-6: Generali; cf. ibid., p. 766: Fratrem.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., p. 796: Aurum.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., p. 790: Episcopus.

<sup>90</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 69.



'judicari' and 'Romanus pon. a solo Deo judicandus'.<sup>91</sup> The bishop of Rome's decision in all cases was to be final 'propter Romanae ecclesiae primatum. Christi munere in beato Petro apostolo divinitus collatum'.<sup>92</sup> No man might 'meddle with any thing that he hath judged'.<sup>93</sup> Cranmer listed a number of cases which were to be reserved for the judgement of the bishop of Rome. These consisted of offences against the liberties of the Church, the violation of interdicts from Rome, conspiracies against the bishop or see of Rome, the murder of priests, the assaulting of bishops, the invasion of lands belonging to Rome or to churches subject to that see, attacks on pilgrims going to Rome or suitors to the court of Rome, and the imposition of charges on churches or clerics. All such offenders could be tried 'by no priest, bishop, archbishop, nor by none other, but only by the bishop of Rome or by his express licence'.<sup>94</sup> In his legal Commonplace Book, Cranmer decisively rejected all such 'casus reservati Romano Pontifici'.<sup>95</sup> In refuting the demands of the Devonshire rebels in 1549, the archbishop again alluded to the list of cases reserved for the Roman Pontiff, which he characterized as 'laws and ordinances...whereof the most part be made for his own advancement, glory and lucre'.<sup>96</sup> Similarly, he

<sup>91</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 779-80: Dudum, Aliorum.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., pp. 802-3: Nemini.

<sup>93</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, loc. cit.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>95</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 867: Etsi dominici gregis.

<sup>96</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 167 and 163.

rejected any idea that the bishop of Rome might hear cases on appeal<sup>97</sup> or agree to grant an appeal.<sup>98</sup> When the accused appealed to Rome, all inferior jurisdictions possessed no power over the litigation. Cranmer noted in the manuscript: 'Nihil decernatur contra illum quem Ro. Pont. appellavit'.<sup>99</sup> He also noted with concern that all those who hindered such appeals to Rome were liable to prosecution.<sup>100</sup> In cases before secular magistrates, appeals to the bishop of Rome were allowed where justice was lacking.<sup>101</sup>

Not only were the Pope's powers in such judicial acta criticized, but the papal constitutions governing all judicial cases were severely censured. Canon law stipulated that 'All manner of causes, whatsoever they be, spiritual or temporal, ought to be determined and judged by the spirituality'.<sup>102</sup> The insight is also recorded in his legal Commonplace Book, only to be rejected: 'Omnes lites terminandae sunt apud viros ecclesiasticos'.<sup>103</sup> He also noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'omnes omnium caussae apud Episcopos tractari et finire possunt'.<sup>104</sup>

It was Thomas Becket in the twelfth century who fought for the prized principle that the trial of criminous

<sup>97</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 777-8: Decreto; cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 70.

<sup>98</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 845-6: Praeterea.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., pp. 777-8: Decreto.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., p. 867: Etsi dominici gregis.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., pp. 835-6: Licet.

<sup>102</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 73.

<sup>103</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 783: Quaecunque Bonifacius.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., p. 787: Volumus.

clerks should take place before ecclesiastical tribunals. Thomas Cranmer noted the same idea, only to reject it. He maintained that the Roman canon law revealed that

none of the clergy shall be called, or sued before any temporal judge, for any manner of cause, either for debt, suit of lands, felony, murder, or for any other cause or crime; nor shall have any other judge, but his bishop only.<sup>105</sup>

Several annotations within the margins of the legal Commonplace Book reveal Cranmer's concern. 'Laici non debent clericos judicare',<sup>106</sup> 'In criminali causa clericus non est examinandus ante civilem iudicem',<sup>107</sup> 'Clericus in causa pecuniaria conveniendus est coram episcopo',<sup>108</sup> and 'Clericus non potest permittere[sic] causam iudicandam iudici civili'.<sup>109</sup>

The authority of bishops in judicial acts was fiercely criticized. Canon law laid down that a bishop might not be tried by any human judge, for the Holy See ruled that they should be tried by God alone. Cranmer noted with concern 'Episcopi a nemine sunt iudicandi'.<sup>110</sup> Similarly, he rejected the notion that bishops might not be admitted as witnesses in legal actions lest they dishonour their office. Cranmer noted the tenor of the Roman law which claimed: 'Episcopus non est admittendus in testem'.<sup>111</sup> Yet, he also noted the

<sup>105</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 166.

<sup>106</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 782: Quod clericus.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., pp. 785-6.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., p. 789: Si quis.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.: Placuit.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., p. 783: Continua.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., p. 784: Testimonium.

contradictions of the Roman code for 'Nemo rejiciet testimonium unius Episcopi'.<sup>112</sup>

Cranmer rejected the idea that no cause could be tried following the judgement of an episcopal court:

'Omnes caussae ab Episcopis terminari possunt et tunc non licet retractari'.<sup>113</sup>

Both clerical and lay causes were to be tried by bishops. Cranmer rejected this and noted in his summary of the legal code that concerning laymen 'bishops only must be their judges'.<sup>114</sup>

By canon law, a bishop might judge temporal causes. Cranmer noted in the margin of the legal Commonplace Book: 'Omnes omnium caussae apud Episcopos tractari et finiri possunt'.<sup>115</sup>

Should any clerk or layman be robbed, the cause should be tried by a bishop. Cranmer rejected this and noted 'Spolatio clericorum et pauperum spectat ad iudicium Episcopi'.<sup>116</sup>

Should a clerk prosecute a case against a layman over the disputed ownership of goods, it might be heard in an ecclesiastical court.<sup>117</sup> Similarly, if a feudal lord should delay in the administration of justice in temporal matters, a bishop may compel him to hear the case.<sup>118</sup>

The result of such stipulations was gross oppression of the laity. In his Answer to the rebels of Devon in 1549, Cranmer stated:

For these decrees be...partial, and against all

<sup>112</sup>Ibid., p. 787: Omnes itaque.

<sup>113</sup>Ibid.

<sup>114</sup>P.S., Cranmer II. p. 72.

<sup>115</sup>Styrye, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 787: Volumus.

<sup>116</sup>Ibid., p. 808: Si quis de.

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., p. 834.: Si clericus.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., pp. 834-5: Ex transmi.

equity and reason, made only for the favour of  
the clergy, and the suppression of the  
laity...<sup>119</sup>

The injustice of such papal constitutions received graphic  
illustration at Cranmer's hands. He protested to the rebels  
that

...a spiritual man may sue a temporal man before  
a temporal or spiritual judge at his pleasure;  
but a temporal man cannot sue a spiritual,  
but only before his ordinary.<sup>120</sup>

Similarly, rectors of parochial benefices 'may convent such as  
do them wrong, whither they will, before a spiritual judge,  
or a temporal'.<sup>121</sup> Consequently, Cranmer rejected all such  
papal constitutions concerning judicial acta, which he  
maintained the Pope made 'for his own advancement, glory and  
lucre, and to make him and his clergy governors of all the  
world'.<sup>122</sup>

Studying the epistles of Gregory VII, Cranmer noted  
in the margin of his legal Commonplace Book:

Gelasius Papa et Anastasius Imperator  
contendebant de preeminencia...dignitatum.  
Sed Gelasius ostendit hoc, quod autoritas  
pontificalis longe maior est quam culmen imperiale.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>119</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 166.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., p. 72. Cf. Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 835-6:  
Cum sit and Licet.

<sup>122</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 163.

<sup>123</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 769: Glossae duo sunt.

Cranmer clearly rejected such a notion. In his speech at the coronation of King Edward VI, Cranmer told the young Prince:

Your majesty is God's vice-gerent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and...the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects...<sup>124</sup>

More than ten years separate the two statements, but it is clear that a consistent principle lay beneath Cranmer's rejection of papal supremacy. In proposing the abolition of papal jurisdiction, Cranmer achieved a measured view of the temporal ruler as Christ's vicar on earth. In the massive sacramental Commonplace Books housed in The British Library, the patristic and Scriptural evidence for such a claim is set out with some force.<sup>125</sup>

Two convictions supported the archbishop's enunciation of such an idea. The Pauline theology of Romans 13<sup>1-2</sup> served as a pillar to support Thomas Cranmer's understanding. 'Que autem sunt, a Deo ordinatae sunt. Itaque qui resistit potestati, Dei ordinationi resistit'. The archbishop noted that the earth swallowed up Dathan and Abiram because of their disobedience. Also, Mary and Joseph obeyed the edict of Caesar Augustus in going to Bethlehem.<sup>126</sup> Such a

<sup>124</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p.127.

<sup>125</sup>B.L., MSS Royal, 7B XI and XII. Their contents suggest that the volumes were compiled between the mid-1530's and the early 1540's. Cf. Sir G.F. Warner and J.P. Gilson, Catalogue of Western MSS. in the Old Royal and King's Collections, 4 vols (London, 1921), I, pp. 172-3; cf. also P.N. Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist (London, 1965), p. 22 n. 2.

<sup>126</sup>B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 316.

conviction led him to investigate all Biblical texts in the light of his crucial Pauline insight. Luke 20<sup>25</sup> proved to be of some difficulty: 'Reddite ergo quae sunt Caesaris. Caesaris: et quae sunt Dei, Deo'. In the papal code of canon law, the text was used to support the conviction that the secular power possessed no authority over the Church, but rather should be subject to the clergy:

Allezatur, imperatori licere omnia, ipsius esse universa. Respondeo. Noli gravare te, imperator, ut putes, te in ea, quae divina sunt, imperiale aliquod ius habere; noli te extollere, sed si vis diutius imperare, esto Deo subditus. Scriptum est: 'Quae Dei Deo: &c. Tributum Caesaris est, non negatur. Ecclesia Dei est...Quod cum imperatoris honorificentia dictum nemo potest negare. Quod enim honorificentius, quam ut imperator ecclesiae filios esse dicatur?'<sup>127</sup>

Cranmer rejected such Scriptural exegesis in his legal Commonplaces. He saw that the theme of the text was not one of dominance by the Church over the State, but rather one of obedience by the spiritual to the temporal sword. The Greek father Theophilactus maintained:

Christus solvendo tributum docet, ut ei qui potestatem habet super corpora nostra, corporaliter subiaceamus; sive Rex ille sit, sive tyrannus, nihil enim hoc nobis nocet ut spiritualiter bene placeamus Deo spirituum. Reddite, enim inquit, quae sunt Caesaris Caesari et quae sunt Dei Deo.<sup>128</sup>

<sup>127</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 806: Convenior.

<sup>128</sup> B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 317; the MS. has the reading of stupor for super. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 194.

By obeying in earthly things, Christ performed a spiritual duty. The same emphasis upon obedience appears in Augustine:

...si quis putat se esse subdendum, ut etiam in suam fidem habere potestatem arbitretur, eum qui temporalibus administrandis aliqua sublimitate precellit in maiorem errorem labitur. Sed modus iste servandus est, quem Dominus ipse prescribit, ut reddamus Caesari que sunt Caesaris et Deo que sunt Dei.<sup>129</sup>

Should anyone wish to usurp the position of a ruler, he commits sin. By showing obedience to the temporal ruler, man fulfils divine law.

The magistrate possessed not only temporal, but also spiritual authority. Cranmer maintained, 'By the scripture the king is chief, and no foreign person in his own realm above him'.<sup>130</sup> If Cranmer claimed as much in his examination before bishop James Brokes at Oxford in 1555, he gave testimony to his views in his sacramental Commonplace Books. 'Christus paruit Caesari in solvendo censu, paruit Pilato et aliis iudiciis ac eorum ministris'.<sup>131</sup> In his Answers to questions concerning the sacraments of 1540,<sup>132</sup> Cranmer maintained

All Christian princes have committed unto them

<sup>129</sup> B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 316v.

<sup>130</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 213.

<sup>131</sup> B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 316.

<sup>132</sup> Thirlby answered the same questions as bishop 'elect of Westminster'. This dates the collection to the year 1540. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 115 n. 1. The Answers from the archbishop's pen, therefore, date from the same period as the sacramental Commonplace Books in The British Library.



immediately of God the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance.<sup>133</sup>

Yet, such ideas concerned not only Christian Princes. Kings, both Christian and heathen, were to be taken as head of the church in their realms. At his examination before Brokes, Cranmer told his astonished accuser:

...Nero was head of the church...for so he beheaded Peter and the apostles...And the Turk too is head of the church in Turkey.<sup>134</sup>

If Cranmer saw that the Prince's powers over the Church stemmed from the direct grant of God, he elsewhere saw that such a position was rooted in his concept of the priesthood of all believers. His earliest enunciation of such a view dates from the mid 1530's. With Bede, he noted:

Non autem de solis episcopis et presbiteris dictum est, qui proprie vocantur in ecclesia sacerdotes, sed sicut omnes Christi dicimur propter mysticum chrisma, sic omnes sacerdotes, qui membra sumus unius sacerdotis...<sup>135</sup>

Such a priesthood was constituted by the Holy Spirit. Augustine saw that Christ at His baptism was baptized with the Holy Spirit. This was the heritage of all men:

...credentes illi et baptismatis illius sanctificatione purgati...omnes in propheticiis et sacerdotibus unguuntur et regibus...<sup>136</sup>

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., p. 116.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid., p. 219.

<sup>135</sup> B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 189v.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., fols 187v.-8.

Such membership was effected only through faith: 'Quod nomen ille...frustra sortitur qui Christum minime imitatur'.<sup>137</sup>

Strengthened by the Holy Spirit first received in baptism, the King's office and vocation was to hold a spiritual cure over his people. In the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, the archbishop noted:

Imo vero Spiritus sanctus statuit principes et magistratus esse Dei ministros, ut benefactis favorem suum impartiant et maleficia suppliciis constringant.<sup>138</sup>

At the coronation of Edward VI, the archbishop asserted that the rites of coronation were merely 'good admonitions to put kings in mind of their duty to God'. Kings were God's anointed by virtue of 'their persons which are elected of God, and endued with the gifts of his Spirit for the better ruling and guiding of his people'.<sup>139</sup>

Cranmer's convictions gained yet further definition from his denunciation of Anabaptist ideas. Anabaptists saw all links between Church and State as sinful and wished to withdraw obedience from civil magistrates. In the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, Cranmer denounced the idea as heretical:

Quin et Anabaptistarum profligandus est aegrestis stupor, qui negant licere Christianis magistratum gerere, quasi propterea Christus in terras descenderit, ut rerum publicarum administrationem aboleret.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> R.L.E., p. 15; De Haeresibus, c. 13; De Magistratibus.

<sup>139</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 126.

Should magistrates be deposed, 'maxima sequeretur omnium rerum confusio'.<sup>140</sup> In the face of the Anabaptist threat, Cranmer wielded a double-edged sword in his defence. He emphasised that magistrates possessed authority by the direct ordinance of God Himself:

The civil magistrate is ordained, and allowed of God: wherefore we must obey him, not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience sake.<sup>141</sup>

He also criticized the Anabaptist concept of Christian liberty, upon which they based their claim to be free from all duty to the State. In the sacramental Commonplace Books, the chapter 'De obedientia erga magistratus' reveals that by the mid 1530's, the archbishop had already achieved a measured expression of his views. Anabaptist ideas concerning baptism led them to assert that the fruit of Christ's passion was freedom from all legal constraints. They founded their views in Pauline theology: 'Empti estis pretio, nolite fieri servi hominum'; 'Si spiritu ducimini, non estis sub lege'; 'Ubi spiritus Domini, ibi libertas'.<sup>142</sup> Such ideas wrecked the structure of mediaeval society. The archbishop answered such objections by carefully analysing his concept of the New Testament covenant. Those who receive the gift of the spirit are not 'sub lege Mosaica aut coherciva', but under 'lege directiva, sicut Adam habuit in paradiso'.<sup>143</sup> Freedom

<sup>140</sup> R.L.E., pp. 14-15.

<sup>141</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 536. Cf B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 316.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. I Corinthians 7<sup>23</sup>; Galatians 5<sup>18</sup>; II Corinthians 3<sup>17b</sup>. Cf. also B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 319.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., fol. 319v.

from the law did not mean liberty to throw off adherence to all external institutions. Cranmer saw that Christians were not under law, but Gospel:

Est igitur christiana seu evangelica libertas non aliud quam (ut Paulo placet) redemptio sive absolutio a servitute legis et peccati per Jesum Christum facta; qua addicti Deo et iusticiae filiorum adoptionem recepimus.<sup>144</sup>

True Christian liberty, therefore, 'non excludit potestatem et obedienciam superioris'.<sup>145</sup> All Anabaptists incur punishment from God for neglecting His Word.<sup>146</sup> In his Sermon on Rebellion of 1549, elicited by the Norfolk rebellion of that year, the archbishop emphasised that Anabaptists were guilty of sedition. Alluding to Thomas Muenzer and the Peasants' Revolt of 1524-6, the prelate stressed that the withdrawal of obedience from magistrates incurred due punishment from God:

[there] were slain within the time of three months above an hundred thousand persons. And what followed further thereof? Great dearth of victual, great hunger and penury?<sup>147</sup>

By the late 1530's, Cranmer had achieved a mature theological understanding of the King's powers within the Church. The analysis of such authority receives graphic

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.

<sup>146</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 198-9.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., pp. 199-200.

illustration in Cranmer's existing writings. The mediaeval doctrine of the two swords is explicitly repudiated. When Cranmer refused to accept the re-establishment of papal jurisdiction in England under Mary, he pointed out that the Pope claimed to bestow temporal power 'unto emperors and kings, to use it under him, but so as it be always at his commandment and beck'.<sup>148</sup> Contrary to this claim, however, Cranmer maintained that

...the imperial crown and jurisdiction temporal of this realm is taken immediately from God, to be used under him only, and is subject unto none, but to God alone.<sup>149</sup>

If the King's temporal sword was bestowed by God alone, Cranmer saw that full spiritual authority was also his by right. In his legal Commonplaces, Cranmer had already achieved a measured expression of his views. He rejected the bull of Boniface VIII Unam Sanctam, which maintained:

Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subiaci potestati...Non est potestas nisi a Deo; quae autem sunt, a Deo ordinatae sunt; non autem ordinatae essent nisi gladius esset sub gladio...<sup>150</sup>

In the same papal bull, Cranmer underlined for a second time the assertion that the received Roman doctrine might rest upon the Pauline theology of Romans 13: 'Quicumque igitur huic potestati a Deo sic ordinatae resistit, Dei

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., p. 447.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., p. 448.

<sup>150</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 831-2: Unam Sanctam. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 71.

ordinationi resistit'.<sup>151</sup> During the twenty years of his archiepiscopate, the archbishop was a forceful advocate of his views. At the coronation of Edward VI, the archbishop maintained that the young King possessed a spiritual sword directly from God. The King was to act as 'a second Josiah, who reformed the church of God in his days'.<sup>152</sup> In A Sermon on Rebellion, written at the time of the Norfolk uprising of 1549, Cranmer emphasised the importance of law-and-order theology. The commons' demands were largely economic and social, but Cranmer insisted that subjects should not take up the sword.<sup>153</sup> 'The sword of the subjects cometh...of the devil'.<sup>154</sup> Alluding to the mediaeval symbolism of the microcosm and macrocosm, the archbishop dismissed the rebels' assumption of the temporal sword:

Who did ever see the feet and legs divide  
themselves from the head and other superior  
parts?<sup>155</sup>

Those who took 'harness upon their backs' would reap 'the anger and vengeance of God, which they shall feel both in this life and in the life to come'.<sup>156</sup>

If the King possessed both swords directly from God, Cranmer also saw that he could not accept a papal supremacy which was against the laws of the realm: '...the

---

<sup>151</sup> Strype, Cranmer, loc. cit.

<sup>152</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 127.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., p. 193; the sources for the sermon are set out in ibid., p. 190 n. 1.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., p. 189.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., p. 193.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid., p. 196.

laws of this realm do agree with the pope's laws like fire and water'.<sup>157</sup> At his examination before bishop James Brokes at Oxford in September 1555, Cranmer pointed out that the Pope's laws were at variance with those of the realm of England. Under canon law, a priest convicted for debt must be tried before an ecclesiastical court, whilst the law of the realm stipulated a temporal judge. Under papal constitutions, a benefice must be given by the bishop. Under English law, 'the patron giveth the benefice'. 'No man can by the laws of Rome proceed in a praemunire; and so is the law of the realm expelled, and the king standeth accursed in maintaining his own laws'.<sup>158</sup> In 1549, he told the Devonshire rebels that if they wished the laws of the realm to be put away in favour of the Pope's laws, they would be traitors.<sup>159</sup> He gave them further examples of the conflict between the sets of laws: 'whosoever doth not acknowledge himself to be under the obedience of the bishop of Rome, is a heretic'. Should they obey this law, they would be guilty of treason by the laws of the realm.<sup>160</sup> All Kings that suffer the bishop of Rome's decrees to be broken in any point are to be condemned as heretics.<sup>161</sup> The same idea formed an important part of his argument in his letter to Queen Mary of 1555, in which he explained why he could not re-admit papal

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., pp. 448-9.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., p. 213.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., pp. 163-4.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., p. 165.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

jurisdiction into England. The canon law itself condemned all decrees against papal constitutions:

Constitutiones contra canones et decreta  
praesulum Romanorum...nullius sunt momenti.<sup>162</sup>

He gave yet further examples to substantiate the charge. Under canon law, the 'jus patronatus' was to be tried only by an ecclesiastical judge, whilst the laws of the realm stipulated a temporal judge.<sup>163</sup> Not only this, but Cranmer also objected that the Prince was to defend the authority of the papal canons:

All kings, bishops, and nobles that allow or suffer the bishop of Rome's decrees in any thing to be violate, be accursed, and for ever culpable before God, as transgressors of the catholic faith.<sup>164</sup>

In his Answer to the rebels of Devon, he insisted that under canon law all Princes' laws which ran contrary to the decrees of the bishop of Rome were invalid.<sup>165</sup> Urging them to put away their own demands, he wrote:

...be subject to princes and rulers, obeying them at a word...Be subject unto kings, as unto chief heads...<sup>166</sup>

Cranmer was keen to set out the powers of the Prince who possessed full powers to rule and govern the Church. He

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., p. 448; the same canon is carefully copied into his legal Commonplace Book. Cf. Strype, Cranmer. III A & A, p. 746: Constitutiones.

<sup>163</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, loc. cit.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid., p. 165.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., p. 164. The quotations are from Titus 3<sup>1</sup> and I Peter 2, vv. 13-14.



might control the election of bishops. He rejected the tenor of the law which laid down:

Laymen may not meddle with elections of the clergy, nor with any other thing that belongeth to them.<sup>167</sup>

In the earlier legal Commonplaces, Cranmer had already rejected the same idea. No layman was to interfere in an election

...cum nullam in talibus potestatem quenquam potestativorum vel caeterorum laicorum habere conveniat.

Cranmer noted in the margin: 'Principes non se intromittant'.<sup>168</sup>

More importantly, however, Cranmer had already come to see that the bishop of Rome himself was not exempt from the power of the Emperor:

Adrianus autem Papa cum universo synodo tradiderunt Karolo jus et potestatem eligendi Pontificem, et ordinandi apostolicam sedem. Dignitatem quoque patriciatus ei concesserat. Insuper Archiepiscopos et Episcopos per singulas provincias ab eo investituram accipere diffinivit, ut, nisi a rege laudetur et investiatur episcopus, a nemine consecratur.<sup>169</sup>

Cranmer was careful to note that canon law showed that Hadrian I in the eighth century granted to Charlemagne the right of election to the Holy See and allowed the principle that bishops

<sup>167</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 72.

<sup>168</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 759-60: Nullus; 'nullam... conveniat' underlined in MS.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., p. 762: Adrianus; 'tradiderunt...diffinivit' underlined in MS.

should be invested by the Prince. Similarly, he noted that the principle had been confirmed at the time of Leo VIII in the tenth century:

...concedimus atque largimur Domino Ottoni primo, regi Theathoniorum. ...in perpetuum facultatem ...summae sedis Apostolice Pontificem ordinandi, ac per hoc archiepiscopos seu episcopos, ut ipsi ab eo investituram accipiant et consecrationem...

Anyone who broke such a constitution was to be punished with perpetual exile or death.<sup>170</sup> Crammer noted with care that the canons themselves decreed that the Prince possessed powers over episcopal appointments, even that of appointing to the see of Rome itself.

Mediaeval thought made a careful distinction between the potestas ordinis and the potestas jurisdictionis of the clerical estate. Following his acceptance of the concept of the priesthood of all believers, Crammer was clear that the clergy possessed no such powers of orders. He claimed that there was 'nothing in the scripture' to prove that it was a sacrament.<sup>171</sup> Consequently, 'there is no more promise of God, that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office'.<sup>172</sup>

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.: In Synodo: 'concedimus...consecrationem' underlined in MS.

<sup>171</sup> P.S., Crammer II, p. 116. Such evidence comes from the Questions and Answers of 1540. It is doubly important, for the archbishop's Answers were to be given to the King. Cf. ibid., p. 117.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., p. 116.

The Prince might therefore assume his role in the appointment of the clergy. Cranmer was asked:

Whether it be forfended by God's law, that  
(if it so fortun'd that all the bishops and  
priests of a region were dead, and that  
the word of God should remain there unpreached,  
the sacrament of baptism and others unministered,) that the king of that region should make  
bishops and priests to supply the same or no?

Cranmer answered with some simplicity, 'It is not forbidden by God's law'.<sup>173</sup> If a 'prince christian-learned' were to conquer certain lands and had only laymen in his retinue, Cranmer asserted that the King may likewise ordain priests:

It is not against God's law, but contrary, they ought indeed so to do; and there be histories that witnesseth, that some christian princes...have done the same.<sup>174</sup>

The archbishop was also asked whether 'the apostles lacking a higher power, as in not having a christian king among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God?' Cranmer replied that all officers and ministers, spiritual and temporal, were 'appointed, assigned, and elected...by the laws and orders of kings and princes'.<sup>175</sup> The apostles made bishops by necessity, not by the law of God:

In the apostles' time when there was no christian princes, ...there was no remedy then for the correction of vice, or appointing

---

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., p. 116.

of ministers, but only the consent of the christian multitude among themselves...

Sometimes, the apostles appointed ministers. The people might also elect them. This was the doctrine of Holy Scripture.<sup>176</sup>

Bishops too might make priests, but it was not an act reserved for prelates alone. Princes might do so, 'and that by the authority of God committed to them'.<sup>177</sup>

Cranmer was clear that ecclesiastical possessions were at the disposal of Princes. He noted from the canon law that 'The goods of the church may in no wise be alienated, but whosoever receiveth or buyeth them, is bound to restitution'. Should the Church possess land of little worth, it was not to be sold to Princes. Should such a sale take place, it was to be void.<sup>178</sup> From the Decretum of Gratian, Cranmer noted the tenor of the law which claimed: 'nec...de rebus ecclesiasticis legatur aliquando laicis attributa disponendi facultas'.<sup>179</sup> Cranmer rejected such a claim and noted the tenor of the law in the margin of the manuscript: 'Principes nullum habent jus de rebus ecclesiasticis disponendi'.<sup>180</sup>

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., pp. 116-17.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., p. 73. In his legal Commonplaces, Cranmer noted the tenor of the canon law and rejected its claims. He wrote in the manuscript: 'Si ex agro ecclesiastico nihil proventus sit, tamen non detur principi, sed clerico vel agricolae. Et si principes emere voluerit, nihil valeat venditio, sed princeps tenetur restituere'; cf. Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 792: Quisquis.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., p. 767: Illud autem.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.; the printed text of the code has disponendis for disponendi.

He therefore rejected all notions that canon law might stipulate the uses to which the riches of the Church might be put. The canons laid down that the funds were to be allocated for bishops, church building, the relief of the poor and the payment of clerks. Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'Opes ecclesiae in quatuor usus sunt accomodandae'.<sup>181</sup>

Similarly, Cranmer accepted that it was lawful for the Prince to tax the clergy. He noted with concern the tenor of the law which maintained: 'it is not lawful for any layman to lay any imposition of taxes, subsidies, or any charges upon the clergy'.<sup>182</sup>

In his legal Commonplace Book, he noted: 'Non licet dominis temporalibus aliquas tallias vel collectas exigere a clericis'.<sup>183</sup>

Laymen might not have benefices to farm. In his legal Commonplace Book, he rejected the canon which maintained 'Laici non habeant ecclesias ad firmam'.<sup>184</sup>

In his Answer to the rebels of Devonshire, he castigated the canon law which reserved punishment for those that 'put any new charges or impositions, real or personal, upon a church or ecclesiastical person'. These 'be the godly and holy decrees which you long so sore for...'.<sup>185</sup> The judgement of all ecclesiastical causes was to pertain to the Prince.

Temporal causes were seen to belong to him by God's ordinance.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid., p. 794: Quatuor.

<sup>182</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 72.

<sup>183</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 857: Quia nullum habentes.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., p. 859: Secundum.

<sup>185</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 167. Cf. Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 855: Laici.

When the Norfolk rebels usurped the temporal sword, Cranmer insisted that the King 'is here in earth God's vicar and chief minister' who 'is ordained of God to have the hearing and decision of such causes'.<sup>186</sup> Spiritual causes too were seen to belong to the King. Canon law maintained: Quis dubitet sacerdotes Christi regum et principum omniumque fidelium patres et magistros censerit?<sup>187</sup> Cranmer rejected the tenor of the law and noted: 'Principes subsunt sacerdotibus, non contra'.<sup>188</sup> In his legal Commonplace Book, he reserved for special comment the canons which sought to lessen the powers of the Prince in judicial acta:

...obsequi solere principes Christianos  
decretis ecclesiae, non suam praeponere  
potestatem; episcopis caput subdere principes  
solitum est, non de eorum capitibus judicare.<sup>189</sup>

Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'Principes debent caput subdere episcopis, parere ecclesiae, non judicare episcopos'. Elsewhere, canon law laid down that bishops were to be judged 'a Deo...non ab humanis', for those buying and selling in the Temple were ejected by Christ alone. Cranmer noted the tenor of the law, only to reject it: 'Episcopi ferendi sunt, non judicandi'.<sup>190</sup> The canons

<sup>186</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 197.

<sup>187</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 769: Quis dubi.; 'Quis... censerit' underlined in MS.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., p. 771: Nunquam: 'episcopis...judicare' underlined in MS.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., p. 778: Accusatio.

concerning heresy were carefully noted. Under mediaeval canon law, the Church might request the secular arm to enforce decrees concerning heresy:

Statuimus insuper, ut potestas...seu quivis alii, qui civitati praesunt...ad requisitionem diocesanorum...jurent praecise attendere inviolabiliter observare ac facere a suis subditis observari...constitutiones contra haereticos...a sede apo. promulgatas.<sup>191</sup>

Cranmer noted with disdain: 'Principes et rectores cogendi sunt juramento ut servent et servari faciant contra haereticos, quicquid sanxerit ecc. Ro.'. He noted too the punishments which were to be incurred by those rulers who failed to comply with the demands of the law: 'Romanus Pon. potest amovere principes et judices ac eos officarios saeculares a suis officiis'. Similarly, he rejected the idea that a notorious heretic might be handed over to the secular arm for punishment by the laws of the Roman Church.<sup>192</sup> Cranmer clearly did not accept the interpretation of the Petrine commission laid down in canon law: 'Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aed. ec. me...usque soluta in coelo'.<sup>193</sup> Rather, the King as head of the Church possessed the power of the keys. In his examination before bishop James Brokes at Oxford in 1555, he maintained:

no man can serve two masters at once, as you

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., pp. 862-3: Ut officium; 'Statuimus...promulgatas' underlined in MS.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., pp. 747-8: Nec liquit.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid., p. 755: Sacrosancta.

in the beginning of your oration declared by the sword and the keys, attributing the keys to the pope, and the sword to the king. But I say the king hath both.<sup>194</sup>

The archbishop reserved special comment for the oaths which Emperors were to make to the Holy See, for they were 'tyrannical and abominable'.<sup>195</sup> Such an oath was to be sworn before consecration might take place. Canon law laid down that the Emperor was to offer to the Church of Rome 'fidelitatis...juramentum, ac nihilominus petendi a nobis per nostras sibi manus unctionem, consecrationem et Romani imperii diadema'.<sup>196</sup> The terms of the oath are set out in the Roman code in varying forms. In its simplest form, the oath ran:

Ego...futurus Imperator promitto...me protectorem, procuratorem et defensorem fore summi Pontificis. Et hujus sanctae Ro. ecclesiae in omnibus necessitatibus et utilitatibus suis custodiendo et conservando possessiones, honores et jura quantum divino suffultus adjutorio fuero, secundum scire et posse meum...<sup>197</sup>

When Otto I was due to come to Rome to be crowned as Emperor in 962 by John XII, he swore an oath to the Roman Pontiff:

si...Roman venero, sanctam ecclesiam Romanam et te rectorem ipsius exaltabo...vitam, aut membra, nunquam neque ipsum honorem...mea exhortatione perdes...

<sup>194</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 213.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>196</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 841: Romani.

<sup>197</sup> Ibid.



Cranmer underlined the following clauses for special comment. Otto swore that he would make no ordinance touching the prerogatives of the Holy See without the Pope's agreement:

et quicquid de terra Sancti Petri ad nostram potestatem pervenerit, tibi reddam, et unicunque Italicum regimen commiserō, jurare faciam illum, ut adjutor tui sit, ad defendendam terram Sancti Petri.<sup>198</sup>

The Emperor's oath of obedience is fully set out in the Clementines. Cranmer noted in the margin of his legal Commonplace Book 'Juramentum Imperatoris tyrannicissimum'.<sup>199</sup> The Emperor was to swear to preserve the catholic faith and to persecute all heretics and

nunquam...schismatico, seu alio quolibet communionem catholicae fidei non habente, aut cum alio aliquo prefatae ecclesiae inimico vel rebelle, seu eidem manifeste suspecto unionem quamlibet seu parentilem aut confederationem iniret...

Rather, they were to defend the bishops of Rome and all the privileges granted by his predecessors to the bishops of Rome or to dependent churches, particularly the grant of temporal lands:

se obligans juramento, quod ipsas aliasve ipsarum partem nullo unquam tempore occuparet seu...ab alio permetteret occupari...

He was to defend ecclesiastical ministers and their churches, and to swear not to oppress vassals of the Roman Church.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., p. 763: Tibi Domino; 'si...exaltabo' and 'et quicquid...terram' underlined in MS.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., pp. 841-3: Romani; 'schismatico...iniret' underlined in MS.

The insight served him well when in 1555 he heard that Queen Mary had sworn an oath of obedience to the Pope:

...if your majesty did make an oath to the pope...I beseech your majesty to look upon your oath made to the crown and realm...I fear me that there be contradictions in your oaths...<sup>200</sup>

It was not simply a matter of oaths. The Pope could not claim a right to control the Emperor and invest him with temporal sovereignty. In his legal Commonplace Book, Cranmer rejected the idea that Emperors should venerate the Holy See

a quo approbationem personae, ad imperialis celsitudinis apicem assumendae, nec non unctionem, consecrationem et imperii coronam accipiunt.<sup>201</sup>

Since Princes derived their authority directly from God, no cleric might presume to bestow power upon them. When Cranmer crowned Prince Edward, he maintained that although the bishops of Rome 'would encroach upon your predecessors by his bishops' act and oil', it was not in his, Cranmer's, 'power to receive or reject them' as rulers.<sup>202</sup> Princes were God's anointed simply by 'their power which is ordained'.<sup>203</sup>

Similarly, he noted that the Pontiff himself had granted to Emperors the right of electing their successors.

---

<sup>200</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 454.

<sup>201</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 841: Romani: 'a quo... accipiunt' underlined in MS.

<sup>202</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 126.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid.

In his legal Commonplaces, he reserved for special comment the fact that 'ad certos eorum principes jus et potestas eligendi regem, in imperatorem postmodum promovendum, pervenit'.<sup>204</sup> He therefore rejected the tenor of the canon law which maintained that Popes might examine those elected as Emperor, a claim advanced by Innocent III in the bull Venerabilem. Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'Ad Romanum Pontificem spectat...examinare electum in imperatorem'.<sup>205</sup>

Nor might the Holy See transfer the empire from one monarch to another. Cranmer noted that the Pope claimed to be able to 'translate the empire from one region to another'.<sup>206</sup> Cranmer reserved for special comment the transfer of power to Charlemagne. The Pope 'imperium in personam magnifici Caroli a Graecis transtulit in Germanos'. Cranmer noted in the margin of the manuscript: 'Ad Romanum Pontificem spectat transferre imperium in imperatorem'.<sup>207</sup>

The excommunication and deposition of Emperors was also condemned by the archbishop. In his coronation address to Edward VI, Cranmer said that he, as archbishop of Canterbury, had no power to 'draw up indentures' between

<sup>204</sup> Strype, Cranmer, loc. cit.: 'ad certos...pervenit' underlined in MS.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., p. 822: Venerabilem.

<sup>206</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 69.

<sup>207</sup> Strype, Cranmer, loc. cit.

God and the King:

I openly declare before the living God, and before these nobles of the land, that I have no commission to denounce your majesty deprived...<sup>208</sup>

In his letters to Queen Mary in 1555, he complained of the same idea. The Pope:

commandeth the subjects to disobey their princes, assailing the subjects as well of their obedience as of their lawful oaths made unto their true kings and princes, directly contrary to God's commandment...<sup>209</sup>

In his legal Commonplace Book, he noted with disdain that Innocent I had excommunicated the Emperor because he had consented to the deposition of John Chrysostom from his see. Even Ambrose, who was not even bishop of Rome, excommunicated Theodosius and banned him from the church.<sup>210</sup> Cranmer noted in the manuscript: 'Pontificatus est principes excommunicare'. In the eighth century, Zacharias confirmed the deposition of the last Merovingian sovereign Childeric III and assented to the anointing of Pepin and his consort.

Canon law noted:

Zacharias scilicet. regem Francorum non tam pro suis iniquitatibus. quam pro eo. quod tantae potestati erat inutilis. a regno suo deposuit...omnesque Francigenas a juramento

<sup>208</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 127.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., p. 451. Cf. ibid., p. 222.

<sup>210</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 769-70: Duo sunt.

fidelitatis absoluit.<sup>211</sup>

Cranmer noted in the manuscript: 'Roma. Pontif. principes excommunicat, deponit, et subditos a juramento absoluit.'<sup>212</sup>

The deposition of Frederick II by Innocent IV at the council of Lyons in 1245 was noted by Cranmer in a lengthy extract from the papal code. Frederick was accused of committing perjury by disrupting the peace between Church and Empire.

He was guilty of sacrilege in imprisoning ecclesiastics on their way to a council. He was tainted with heresy and had incurred the wrath of the Holy See in his administration of Sicily, which he held of the see of Rome. The Emperor was therefore excommunicated and all subjects were absolved from obedience to him. The Pope, dressed in papal vestments, and eleven bishops assembled for the proclamation of the sentence. Each bishop carried a wax taper which he threw down to the ground as a sign of divine retribution. Noting the dissension between contending parties which resulted from the Pope's act, Cranmer wrote in his legal Commonplaces:

Romani pontificis est, principes excommunicare,  
deponere, et subditos ad rebellionem  
coercere...<sup>213</sup>

If Thomas Cranmer was concerned to restore to the Prince his true heritage within the Church, he was nonetheless

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., p. 798: Alius: 'Zacharias...fidelitatis' underlined in MS.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid.; cf. ibid., p. 823: Venerabilem; cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 70.

<sup>213</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 843-5: Perjurium.

clear that the King's powers were subject to God's authority. When Cranmer appeared before Brokes at Oxford in 1555, the bishop taunted him by saying that he, Cranmer, had made Henry VIII head of the Church in place of Christ. Cranmer replied:

No...for Christ is only head of his church and of the faith and religion of the same. The king is head and governor of his people, which are the visible church.<sup>214</sup>

Should Princes fail in their duty, God would punish the whole nation. The idea received graphic illustration in A Sermon concerning the time of Rebellion, delivered to the Norfolk rebels in 1549. Should the magistrates be slow in their duties to punish offenders, it was right that the people should be punished by God. Eli was slow to punish his children and his leniency caused the destruction of many Israelites. The whole tribe of Benjamin was destroyed because they left unpunished the abusing of the Levite's wife. More than twenty-five thousand people were slain and no more than six hundred were spared.<sup>215</sup> In short, Cranmer came to see that the sins of the magistrates were to be visited upon the people committed to their charge. Yet, obedience offered to the magistrate was to be tempered by the demands of Holy Scripture. In his Notes for the homily against rebellion in 1549, the archbishop declared that 'subjects must obey in

---

<sup>214</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 224.

<sup>215</sup>Ibid., pp. 191-2.

all worldly things, as the Christians do under the Turk, and ought so to do, so long as he commandeth them not to do against God'.<sup>216</sup> He noted that Augustine's understanding of Romans 13 was similar:

Qui resistit potestati, Dei ordinationi resistit. Sed quid si illud iubeatur, quod non debeas facere? Si aliquid iusserit creator, faciendum est; tamen si contra proconsul iubeat, non utique contemnis potestatem sed eligis maiori servire. Ne huic debeat minor irasci, si maior prelatus est.<sup>217</sup>

Cranmer seems to have concluded that in such cases, divine law did not forbid the withdrawal of obedience from magistrates.

The absence of contemporary continental tracts among the archbishop's existing works concerning his concept of the godly Prince makes any assessment of his ideas incomplete. Separation from Rome meant lonely isolation at a time when the church of England stood or fell by the quality of its theology. As archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer supplied that need. Mr Jasper Ridley has suggested that Cranmer's concept of royal supremacy grew from his connections with the Tudor Court.<sup>218</sup> Rather, the archbishop's massive Commonplace Books show that his ideas were rooted in Holy Scripture. Did not the first Epistle of Peter lay down: 'Be subject unto kings as unto chief heads...?'<sup>219</sup>

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., p. 188.

<sup>217</sup> B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 316v.

<sup>218</sup> Ridley, op. cit., p. 65.

<sup>219</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 164; cf. B.L., MSS Royal 7B XII, fol. 316. The text is an allusion to I Peter 2, vv. 13-14.

## PART THREE



Continuity and Change: the appointment of Thomas Cranmer to  
the see of Canterbury

...the metropolitans of this realm...  
be bound to the obedience of their prince,  
and to seek also the quietation and  
peaceableness of this realm, which ought  
to be regarded more than any man's law...<sup>1</sup>

On 15 May 1532, archbishop William Warham was the leading prelate who acceded to the royal demands laid down in the Submission of the Clergy.<sup>2</sup> He had offered a spirited defence of his position. In a blistering speech which he apparently intended to deliver before the council, Warham asserted his opposition to the crown's attack upon the church.<sup>3</sup> The crown had attempted to weaken his position by charging him with an offence under the statutes of praemunire for consecrating the bishop of St Asaph some fourteen years before without first exhibiting the bulls of appointment to the King. Warham insisted that the point for which the King was contending was one of the articles which Henry II sought to extort from

---

<sup>1</sup> A Glasse of the Truthe, printed in Records of the Reformation: The Divorce 1527-1533 [henceforth cited as Rec. Ref.], ed. in 2 vols by N. Pocock (Oxford, 1870), II, pp. 418-19. The crucial Reformation tract dates from the year 1532. Cf. Elton, P & P, pp. 175-80.

<sup>2</sup> The events surrounding the passage of this document are described in M.J. Kelly, 'The Submission of the Clergy' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, vol. XV [Fifth Series] (1965), pp. 97-119.

<sup>3</sup> The date of this draft speech is unclear. The speech is printed in the Dublin Review, vol. CXIV (1894), pp. 401-14; L.P., V, 1247. Dr Kelly has dated the speech to March/April 1532; cf. Kelly, art. cit., p. 103 n. 3.

the council of Clarendon in 1164. St Thomas had died as a martyr to oppose such an idea. In the face of the crown's attack, Warham underlined the penalties awaiting those who laid violent hands upon a bishop. Although Warham assented to the demands embodied in the Submission of May 1532, Dr Kelly has shown that it was enacted by a 'rump convocation'.<sup>4</sup> Warham's death on 22 August<sup>5</sup> removed him from the earthly arena and from further harassment at the hands of the government.

Following Warham's death, the administration of the diocese and province of Canterbury fell into some confusion. No administrative records survive among the muniments of the prior and chapter of Canterbury for this vacancy.<sup>6</sup> The pattern of administration sede vacante was governed by a composition of 1278.<sup>7</sup> Cromwell himself made a note of the privileges of the metropolitical church and made use of a book which recorded such important details.<sup>8</sup> By the terms of the mediaeval composition, the prior was to nominate two names to the bishop of London within a month of the vacancy. One of these was to be chosen by the bishop within two days to act as official of Canterbury in the name of the prior and chapter. On 18 September, the King wrote an important letter

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Kelly, art. cit., pp. 115-17.

<sup>5</sup>D.N.B., sub nomine.

<sup>6</sup>Smith, Registers, p. 17.

<sup>7</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fols 36v.-7. Cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 48.

<sup>8</sup>L.P., V, 1268. The letter from Thomas Bedyll to Cromwell is undated, but it is probably to be assigned to the year 1532.

concerning the vacancy.<sup>9</sup> He wished a commission to be issued to Richard Gwent as dean of the arches and master of the prerogative. Gwent was appointed master of the prerogative on 22 September.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, John Cockes was to be appointed as vicar general and auditor of causes. Richard Strete and David Pole were to be appointed as vicars general as they were with Gwent in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield. The only surviving administrative record at Lambeth or Canterbury concerning the prior's jurisdiction dates from December 1532 when John Cockes as vicar general in spirituals awarded a pension of £18 to Richard Parkehurst from the fruits of the parish church of Earde or Crayford.<sup>11</sup> On 12 October, Peter Ligham told bishop Fisher that the prior had named him, Ligham, as vicar general and master of the prerogative. The King rejected the nomination, alleging that Ligham was too inexperienced.<sup>12</sup> Five days later, Cromwell wrote to the prior

<sup>9</sup> The letter survives in draft only. The addressee is not recorded. Cf. P.R.O., SP 1/71, p. 45; L.P., V, 1326. Another draft of the letter survives, dated 16 September and corrected by Cromwell; of. SP 1/71, p. 44. On the first draft, Cromwell added a correction not contained on the second, namely that the addressee was to be told to come before the King and council to exhibit the privileges and grants from his predecessors.

<sup>10</sup> Churchill, *Administration*, II, p. 237.

<sup>11</sup> C.R., fols 34v.-6v. The decree was drawn up in the name of the prior and chapter of Canterbury 'ad quos omnis et omnimoda iurisdiclio spiritualis et ecclesiastica que ad archiepiscopum Cant' pertinet sede plena, ipsa sede iam per obitum recolende memorie domini Willelmi Warham nuper diote sedis archiepiscopi vacante notorie dinoscitur pertinere'; of. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 47.

<sup>12</sup> L.P., V, 1411.

and told him to award the commissaryship of Calais to William Peterson and John Benolte; the appointment was made on 23 October.<sup>13</sup> The government was concerned with the convocation of the province. In Cromwell's Remembrances for November 1532, he noted that the King's will concerning that body was to be ascertained.<sup>14</sup> The prior of Canterbury was unequal to his new responsibilities. On 13 January 1533, he told Cromwell that he felt too lowly to act among mighty men. On 1 February, he sent Cromwell as requested a commission with a blank space for the name to be inserted as president of convocation by the King.<sup>15</sup>

An important result of the government's policy during the vacancy in the see of Canterbury was the appointment in March 1533 of Thomas Cranmer as archbishop. It was Thomas Cranmer who finally determined the matter of the King's 'divorce' from Catherine of Aragon. In the months before Cranmer's appointment, the key to papal policy over the divorce was one of appeasement. In July 1532 Ortiz, an imperial agent, renewed his request for Henry VIII to be excommunicated.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 1465.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 1548. A book of privileges of Christ Church Canterbury made special mention of the prior's ability to summon convocation. In August 1532, Thomas Bedyll asked Cromwell to return the book in order that he might ascertain the prior's rights in the matter. Cf. ibid., 1268.

<sup>15</sup> L.P., VI, 108; cf. ibid., 34 and 88. The government's indecision stemmed from the fact that on 5 February, an important meeting of clerics and laymen was to discuss the Act in Restraint of Appeals. The list of those present was drawn up between 25 January and 5 February; cf. ibid., 150. Cf. G.R. Elton, 'The evolution of a Reformation statute' in Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1974-83), II, pp. 98-9. Standish of St Asaph was eventually chosen as president, although Stokesley of London continued to preside at most meetings; cf. S.E. Lehmberg, The Reformation Parliament 1529-36 (Cambridge, 1970), p. 176.

The Pope, however, evaded the demand by insisting that he was not skilled in law and that he felt bound to consult with lawyers.<sup>16</sup> Such caution was certainly echoed by the Emperor, Charles V. Although Charles wished justice for his aunt, Catherine of Aragon, he feared the friendship between Henry and the King of France. Chapuys even told the Emperor on 26 August 1532 that heavy bets were being placed on a marriage between Henry and the French royal family. Given the amity between the two Kings, the Pope would have to provoke their joint enmity in determining the marital suit. Should a few ships be armed in Flanders, the proposed meeting between Henry and Francis of France at Calais and Boulogne would not take place.<sup>17</sup> Whilst the Pope and the Emperor were at Bologna in late 1532 and the opening months of 1533, Henry VIII announced the nomination of Thomas Cranmer to the vacant see of Canterbury. The news caused great surprise in London when it became known at the beginning of January.<sup>18</sup> One report insisted that the King had intimated the appointment

<sup>16</sup> Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers relating to the negotiations between England and Spain [from the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary, 1485-1558] edited in 13 vols by G. Bergenroth, P. de Gayangos, M.A.S. Hume and R. Tyler (London, 1862-1954), and 2 Supplements, edited by G.A. Bergenroth and G. Mattingly (London, 1868-1940) [henceforth cited as C.S.P.], vol. IV, pt ii, 979.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 986.

<sup>18</sup> L.P., VI, 89. Carlo Capello, the Venetian ambassador in England, predicted on 26 August 1532 that the archbishopric would be awarded to either Gramello [Cranmer?] or to Reginald Pole. Cf. Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English affairs [Venetian] 1202-1675, edited in 38 vols by R. Brown, G. Cavendish Bentinck, H.F. Brown and A.B. Hinds (London, 1864-1940), IV, 799.

to Cranmer, as yet a mere archdeacon, at a bear-baiting.<sup>19</sup> Cranmer himself had no real wish to receive such preferment.<sup>20</sup> He is first mentioned as archbishop elect on 26 January.<sup>21</sup> In a letter dated 27-29 January, Chapuys underlined for the Emperor the dangers inherent in Cranmer's appointment. As apostolic legatus natus, the archbishop of Canterbury would be able to authorize the King's divorce from Catherine of Aragon.<sup>22</sup> It was well-known that Cranmer favoured the King's cause. Since his departure from Cambridge in 1529, he had been fully occupied in the matter.<sup>23</sup> The archbishop elect sent to Bologna for the bulls in the last days of January 1533.<sup>24</sup> Early in February, Chapuys repeated his warning in a crucial letter to the Emperor at Bologna. He maintained that the King was under the influence of Anne Boleyn and her father the earl of Wiltshire, who were perfect Lutherans. Should the Pope not excommunicate Henry, he would lose his authority as his censures would gradually not be respected. Alluding to the meeting in early February of clerical and lay doctors, Chapuys told the Emperor that the King had boasted more than twice that he would have the case tried as soon as the papal bulls of provision for the archbishop elect arrived. Chapuys urged that the only remedy was for

<sup>19</sup> N. Harpsfield, A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, edited for The Camden Society by N. Pocock (London, 1878), p. 290. B. Jones, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, VIII, p. 17.

<sup>20</sup> Foxe, A & M, VIII, p. 55; P.S., Cranmer II, p. 216.

<sup>21</sup> L.P., VI, 73.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 89.

<sup>23</sup> D.N.B., XIII, 19-20.

<sup>24</sup> St. P., VII, p. 411; L.P., VI, 101.

the Pope to defer the expedition of the bulls until the sentence of excommunication was delivered; a pretext for this would suffice. Otherwise, an express condition might be inserted into the papal bulls, or in the form of the oath of loyalty to the Holy See, not to hinder the affair. He urged that the papal nuncio had twice informed the Pope of the situation. Clement VII would not be so hasty to confirm Cranmer's appointment if he knew that Cranmer were a Lutheran.<sup>25</sup> The papal bull of provision for Thomas Cranmer's appointment to Canterbury is dated at Bologna, 21 February 1533.<sup>26</sup> Chapuys' letter of 27-29 January arrived at Bologna on that very day, for it is endorsed 'From the ambassador in England. 27th and 29th January 1533. Received the 21st of February'.<sup>27</sup> Chapuys' second despatch also reached Bologna at that time, since on 22 February Ortiz informed the Empress that letters from Chapuys of 9 February had arrived there.<sup>28</sup> Convinced

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>26</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 2-v.

<sup>27</sup> C.S.P., IV, ii, no. 1043. Despite uncertainty over the Emperor's itinerary, it is clear that the ambassador's letters were received by him in person. Chapuys' letter of 15 March was endorsed 'From the ambassador in England. Received the 7th of April, on the Emperor's embarkation for Spain at Genoa'; cf. ibid., 1056. Similarly, his letter of 15 February was received on 15 March at Milan. Tyler has shown that following his departure from Bologna on 28 February, the Emperor was due to visit Milan before embarking for Spain at Genoa; cf. R. Tyler, The Emperor Charles the Fifth (London, 1956), p. 332. Cf. also C.S.P., IV, ii, 1048.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 1051. The letter survives in two forms; cf. also ibid., no. 1050. One is dated at Rome and the second at Bologna. Ortiz had been in Bologna since December 1532. Since Charles V did not leave until 26 February, it is probable that Ortiz heard of the receipt of Chapuys' letters at Bologna; cf. ibid., 1035, 1042, 1044 and 1052.



that the loyalty of the English church was at stake, Chapuys had urged his messenger to travel with all haste. The latter covered the distance from London to Bologna in the astonishing time of thirteen days.

In terms of ecclesiastical administration, the central document recorded in the archbishop's Register is the papal bull of provision. Since the fourteenth century, papal provision had displaced capitular election as the method of appointment to vacant diocesan sees.<sup>29</sup> The bull Divina disponente clemencia duly announced the provision of Thomas Cranmer to the archiepiscopal throne:

...de persona tua...prefate ecclesie...  
apostolica auctoritate providemus, teque  
illi in archiepiscopum preficimus et pastorem,  
curam et administrationem ipsius ecclesie  
tibi in spiritualibus plenarie committendo...<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> John de Trillek, bishop of Hereford, was the last bishop before the Reformation settlement to receive his election at the hands of his diocesan chapter. Cf. The Register of John de Trillek, bishop of Hereford, ed. by J.H. Parry (Canterbury and York Society, 8, 1910), p. 1. During the council of Constance, certain prelates were elected by diocesan chapter, but Martin V seems to have treated their appointments as canonically invalid; cf. The Register of Henry Chichele, archbishop of Canterbury 1414-43 [henceforth cited as Chich. R.], ed. in 4 vols by E.F. Jacob and H.C. Johnson (Canterbury and York Society, 42, 45-7, 1937-47), I, pp. lxxxviii-xciv.

<sup>30</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 2-v. Mr A.J. Edwards erroneously states that there is an 'absence of the bull to Cranmer providing him to Canterbury: The bull of Clement VII of 1532 [sic] providing Cranmer is addressed to the King in the first instance'; cf. A.J. Edwards, The sede vacante administration of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer 1533-53 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the M. Phil. degree, university of London, 1968), p. 9. The document cited by Mr Edwards, however, is a notification to the King of the act of papal provision; cf. C.R., fol. 1-v. For all the documents concerning the appointment of Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, cf. Appendix, Papal Bulls.



It is clear that Chapuys' advice concerning the wording of the bulls was not heeded, for the bull is in common form throughout:

...demum ad te, archidiaconum de Tawnton, in ecclesia Wellensi, magistrum in theologia. in presbyteratus ordine constitutum... direximus oculos nostre mentis.<sup>31</sup>

The bull seems to underline the relative obscurity from which Cranmer was now to emerge. Unbeknown to the papal officials, Cranmer had become a doctor of divinity in 1526.<sup>32</sup> Notifications of the act of provision, enjoining obedience to the archbishop elect, were sent to the suffragans of the southern province,<sup>33</sup> to the clergy of the city and diocese of Canterbury,<sup>34</sup> to the chapter of Canterbury cathedral<sup>35</sup> and to the people of the city and diocese of Canterbury.<sup>36</sup> Mediaeval precedent also

<sup>31</sup> C.R., fol. 2.

<sup>32</sup> Grace Books [of Cambridge University], ed. by S.M. Leathes and M. Bateson, 4 vols in 5 (Cambridge, 1897-1910), Grace Book V, p. 225; cf. Grace Book B, ii, p. 130.

<sup>33</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 2v.; cf. Warham's Register [henceforth cited as W.R.], fols 1v.-2; Morton's Register [henceforth cited as M.R.], I, fol. 2; Stafford's Register [henceforth cited as S.R.], fols 1v.-2; Kempe's Register [henceforth cited as K.R.], fol. 211; Chich. R., I, pp. 9-10.

<sup>34</sup> C.R., fol. 3; W.R., fol. 2; M.R., I, fol. 2v.; S.R., fol. 2-v.; K.R., fol. 211v.; Chich. R., I, p. 10.

<sup>35</sup> C.R., loc. cit.; cf. K.R., fols 210v.-11; Chich. R., I, p. 9.

<sup>36</sup> C.R., fol. 3v.; cf. W.R., loc. cit.; M.R., I, fols 2v.-3; S.R., fol. 3-v.; K.R., fol. 211v.; Chich. R., I, p. 10.

dictated that since the archbishop was a temporal magnate, a bull should be sent to the tenants of this prince of the Church.<sup>37</sup>

Similarly, a customary bull was issued to the archbishop elect, releasing him from all ecclesiastical censures and interdicts.<sup>38</sup>

On 22 February, there was despatched notification to the archbishop of the form of the oath of loyalty to the Holy See to be taken at his consecration.<sup>39</sup> As was customary, the consecrating bishop was to receive the archbishop's fealty.<sup>40</sup> As archbishop of Canterbury elect, Cranmer was to swear to be faithful to the Church of Rome, Clement VII and to his successors. He was not to enter into league with the Pope's enemies, lest men lay violent hands upon the pontiff. He was to defend the papacy and the regalia of St Peter against all men. Legates of the apostolic see were to be treated with due reverence and he was to seek to increase the authority of the Roman Church:

Regulas sanctorum patrum, decreta, ordinationes,  
sentencias, dispensationes, reservationes,  
provisiones et mandata apostolica totis viribus  
observabo et faciam ab aliis observari.  
Hereticos, scismaticos et rebelles domino nostro  
et successoribus predictis pro posse persequar  
et impugnabo.

<sup>37</sup> C.R., fol. 3-v.; cf. W.R., loc. cit.; M.R., I, fol. 2-v.; S.R., fols 2v.-3; K.R., fols 211v.-12; Chich. R., I, p. 10.

<sup>38</sup> Strype reserved special comment for the bull, suggesting that Cranmer had been stained with Lutheranism; cf. C.R., fol. 2 and Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 38. The issue of such a bull, however, was routine. Cf. also W.R., fol. 1v.; M.R., I, fols 1v.-2.

<sup>39</sup> C.R., fol. 1v.-2.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.; cf. Churchill, Administration, I, p. 260; cf. also Registrum Ricardi Mayew, episcopi Herefordensis, ed. by A.T. Bannister (Canterbury and York Society, 27, 1921), pp. 4-5.

He was to attend councils when summoned and to visit Rome at accustomed times. He was not to sell the possessions of his archbishopric.<sup>41</sup>

On 3 March, notification was sent to the archbishop elect of the despatch of the pallium. It had been sought on Cranmer's behalf by Francis Coluccius, a scribe in the papal familia. It was sent to the archbishop of York and to the bishop of London.<sup>42</sup> The pallium signified the plenitudo pontificalis officii which the archbishop was to enjoy as metropolitan of the province of Canterbury. As Hawkins wrote to Henry VIII from Bologna on 22 February:

This pall is a pece of white cloth made of the wool of certen lambis, whiche the Pope halowith, and consecrat[sic] bi the Pope, and leide upon Saint Petre his sepulchre.<sup>43</sup>

Along with the mandate to the clerics, the form of words to be used at the bestowal of the pallium is carefully recorded:

AD HONOREM DEI OMNIPOTENTIS et Beate Marie Virginis ac beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli et domini nostri domini Clementis septimi et sancte Romane Ecclesie necnon Cantuariensis ecclesie tibi commisse, tibi tradimus pallium de corpore beati Petri sumptum, plenitudinem videlicet pontificalis officii, ut eo utaris infra ecclesiam tuam certis diebus qui exprimuntur in privilegiis et ab apostolica sede concessis.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>41</sup>C.R., loc. cit.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., fols 3v.-4.

<sup>43</sup>St. P., VII, p. 425; L.P., VI, 177.

<sup>44</sup>C.R., fol. 4.

The bulls themselves arrived in England about 26 March.<sup>45</sup> Despite Chapuys' urgent entreaties, it is clear that both Pope and Emperor at Bologna were powerless to refuse Henry's request. The form of the oath of loyalty to the Holy See, which Cranmer was to swear, was exactly the same, with minor verbal variations, as that sworn by William Warham on his own translation to Canterbury.<sup>46</sup> The Pope was careful to emphasise that the appointment took place at the instigation of the King:

pro quo carissimus in Christo filius noster  
Henricus Anglie Rex illustris nobis super  
hoc humiliter supplicavit.<sup>47</sup>

In the notification to the King of the act of papal provision, the same idea finds measured expression.<sup>48</sup>

It was the act in conditional restraint of annates which forced the Pope to grant the bulls of provision. The statute laid down that should any bulls be delayed or denied for the consecration of any bishop, he was to be consecrated without them. If an archbishop was to be so nominated, the consecrating bishops were to be appointed by the King.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>45</sup> L.P., VI, 296.

<sup>46</sup> L.P.L., W.R., fol. 2v.; cf. C.R., fols 1v.-2.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., fol. 1-v. The original notification is in P.R.O., C. 82. 667; L.P., VI, 417(2711); it is tagged to the writ restoring to the archbishop the temporalities of the see. For the bull Gracie divine premium concerning the appointments of archbishops Stafford, Kempe and Bourghier, cf. Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters...1198-1492, edited in 14 vols by W.H. Bliss, C. Johnson and J.A. Twemlow (London, 1893-1960), IX, p. 342; X, p. 602; ibid., pp. 699-700.

<sup>49</sup> Stat. Realm. III, pp. 385-8. The statute encountered great opposition in parliament. Cf. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p. 301.

Henry even sent a copy to his agents in Rome to show the Pope and cardinals. The accompanying letter made it clear that the statute would be implemented if the papal curia refused to fulfil the King's wishes.<sup>50</sup> On 21 February, Hawkins wrote to the King concerning the cost of the bulls. These would cost 10,000 ducats. Campeggio, who proposed the vacancy in consistory, would be paid 1500 ducats. The Pope's officers, for small services, would demand 3,000 or 4,000 ducats. The pallium would cost 1,000 ducats more.<sup>51</sup> On 31 January, Bonner had written to Benet at Bologna that if Cranmer were not gently handled over the question of annates, the statute of 1532 would come into force.<sup>52</sup> So anxious was the Holy See to retain the King's favour that the sum demanded in annates was fiercely contested. Hawkins told the King:

The 21st of Februari Campegius proponid, in the Consistori, to the Pope and Cardinales, the vacation and desired Bulles for the Electe, for hitherto thei could not agre on the price. The taxe of the Annat, after the rigor, is 10 thousand ducates. Thei have ben sore cumbrid with debating of this mater, whether thei shuld remitte oni thing, or no.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>50</sup> St. P., VII, pp. 360-3; L.P., V, 886. Scarisbrick has shown that the proposed marriage between the son of Francis I and the Pope's niece also served as a weapon in the general cause of the divorce; cf. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, p. 308.

<sup>51</sup> St. P., VII, p. 425; L.P., VI, 177.

<sup>52</sup> St. P., VII, p. 411; L.P., VI, p. 101.

<sup>53</sup> St. P., VII, p. 425; L.P., VI, 177.

The King was also anxious to obtain the bulls for Cranmer's appointment, for he advanced the money for the archbishop elect himself. Between February and December 1533, the King lent Thomas Cranmer over £1, 000. In addition, the restitution of the temporalities of the see in April 1533 was to date from 29 September 1532.<sup>54</sup> Chapuys told Charles V that the King had advanced money for the expedition of the bulls.<sup>55</sup>

The final document in the opening section of the archiepiscopal Register is a public instrument, recording the archbishop's celebrated protestation made at his consecration at the hands of John Longland, bishop of Lincoln, assisted by the bishops of Exeter and St Asaph in St Stephen's chapel, Westminster, on 30 March 1533.<sup>56</sup> The sticking point for the archbishop was the oath of loyalty which he was to take to the Holy See.<sup>57</sup> The archbishop first read his protestation 'in quadam papiri schedula quam tunc ibidem in manibus suis tenuit' in the chapter house before the ceremony of consecration.<sup>58</sup> In the chapel, Cranmer knelt at the high altar in the presence of John Longland and the two assistant bishops. He then swore his fealty to the Holy See, having first declared that the oath was to be qualified by the terms of his protestation.<sup>59</sup> After the

<sup>54</sup> L.P., VI, 131, 150, 841 and 999; of. Elton, art. cit., pp. 98-9; P.R.O., C. 82. 667; L.P., VI, 417(27).

<sup>55</sup> L.P., VI, 89.

<sup>56</sup> C.R., fols 4-5v.; the protestation alone is printed in Strype, Cranmer, I, pp. 329-30.

<sup>57</sup> C.R., fols 1v.-2; of. ibid., fol. 5-v.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., fol. 4-v.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., fols 4v.-5.

ceremony of consecration, Cranmer prepared to receive the pallium. He again asserted that he understood the oath of loyalty, which he was about to take, according to the terms of the protestation. For a second time, he swore the oath of loyalty to the Holy See.<sup>60</sup> In his protestation, Cranmer maintained that he swore the oath of loyalty to the Pope 'pro forma potius quam pro esse':

Non est nec erit mee voluntatis aut intentionis per huiusmodi iuramentum vel iuramenta, qualitercumque verba in ipsis posita sonare videbuntur me obligare ad aliquod ratione eorundem posthac dicendum, faciendum aut attemptandum quod erit aut esse videbitur contra legem Dei vel contra illustrissimum Regem nostrum Anglie aut rempublicam huius sui regni Anglie, leges ve aut prerogativas eiusdem; et quod non intendo per huiusmodi iuramentum aut iuramenta quovismodo me obligare quominus libere loqui, consulere et consentire valeam in omnibus et singulis reformationem religionis cristiane, gubernationem ecclesie anglicane aut prerogativam corone eiusdem rei publice commoditatem quoquomodo concernentibus et ea ubique exequi et reformare que mihi in ecclesia anglicana reformanda videbuntur.

Any oath taken by his proctor at Rome was to be invalid, for he did not wish any oath which the former may have sworn to run 'contrarium aut repugnans iuramento per me prestito aut imposterum prestando prefato illustrissimo Anglie Regi'.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., fol. 5-v.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., fol. 4v.

It was not until 1534 that the oath of loyalty to the Pope was abolished by statute. The act laid down that from henceforth, no bulls were to be obtained from Rome for appointments to an English bishopric. Rather, the diocesan chapter were to elect the crown's nominee. Following an oath of fealty to the crown, the candidate's election was to be confirmed by the archbishop of the province.<sup>62</sup> As early as 1532, the government had felt qualms over such an oath. On 11 May, the King told the Speaker of the House of Commons that the clergy were

but halfe our subiectes, yea and soace our  
subiectes: for all the Prelates at their  
consecracion, make an othe to the Pope,  
clene contrary to the othe that they make to  
vs...<sup>63</sup>

The King's speech made a great impression on Edmund Hall.<sup>64</sup> Between 11 and 14 May, a bill concerning the oaths of the prelates was read once in the House of Commons. Cromwell noted the bill in his Remembrances for February 1533. Nothing appears to have come of the bill. It is possible that opposition in parliament persuaded the government not to press forward with the measure.<sup>65</sup> The Glasse of Truthe, produced

---

<sup>62</sup>Stat. Realm, III, pp. 462-4. The statute encountered great opposition in parliament. Cf. S.E. Lehmberg, The Reformation Parliament 1529-1536 (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 190-1. Cf. also Elton, P & P, pp. 227-8. In the opening months of 1534, Thomas Goodrich and Rowland Lee both swore an oath in favour of the crown. Cf. P.R.O., SP 1/83, fols 59v.-60 and G. Burnet, Hist. Ref., VI, 290-1; L.P., VII, 427 and 514.

<sup>63</sup>E. Hall, Chronicle: containing the history of England during the reign of Henry the Fourth and the succeeding monarchs to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth (London, 1809), p. 788.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., pp. 788-9.

<sup>65</sup>L.P., VI, 120. When the Act in Restraint of Appeals was



in the autumn of 1532, made passing reference to the oath. Proposing that the divorce of King Henry VIII from Catherine of Aragon should be tried in England, it suggested that the

king's highness and his parliament should earnestly press the metropolitans of this realm (their unjust oath made to the Pope notwithstanding) to set an end shortly in this...<sup>66</sup>

Significantly, the oath was mentioned in the opening draft of the Act in Restraint of Appeals which complained of bishops who accepted their spiritual jurisdiction at the hands of the see of Rome. Popes accepted

a corporal othe of obedience and subieccion to the see Apostolik contrary to their naturall dutie of obedience and alegiaunce that they shold and own to be to the Kinges of this realme...<sup>67</sup>

The opening draft of the act dates from the autumn of 1532. The clause was later dropped and does not appear in the final statute.<sup>68</sup> Three important propaganda tracts were published in 1533 and 1534. Late in 1533, Berthelet published a tract

---

presented to the Commons on 14 March 1533, it met substantial opposition; cf. Lehmberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-6. The act concerning the prelates' oaths is probably to be identified with a draft statute concerned with the legislative powers of the church. Cf. P.R.O., SP 2/P, fols 17-19; L.P., VII, 57(2). Cf. also Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, pp. 299 and 396. Cromwell collected copies of the prelates' oath for his own use; cf. L.P., VI, 299[p. 131]. These documents occur in a 'catalogue of my Master's writings, being in my Master's closet, that were brought since All Hallow tide, A° 24R[H] viij'.

<sup>66</sup> Pocock, *Rec. Ref.*, II, pp. 418-19.

<sup>67</sup> P.R.O., SP 2/M, fol. 82; cf. Elton, *art. cit.*, pp. 87-8.

<sup>68</sup> *Stat. Realm.*, III, 427-9.

entitled Articles devised by the whole consent of the King's most honourable Council.<sup>69</sup> In 1534, Richard Sampson produced an Oratio.<sup>70</sup> In the same year, the government gave its approval to the publication of A Little Treatise against the muttering of some papists in corners.<sup>71</sup> All such propaganda tracts contain no mention of the oath. Before the act of 1534, it was mentioned in no further statute or royal proclamation.<sup>72</sup> On 19 April 1533, the temporalities of the see were restored to the archbishop.<sup>73</sup> As was customary, the archbishop swore an oath of loyalty to the crown:

I, T.C., renononce and utterly forsake all suche clauses, wordes, sentences, and grauntes, whiche I have of the Pope's holynes in his bulles of the archbishopriche of Caunterbury... knowlaging my selfe to take and holde the saide archbishopriche...of your highnis and of non other...<sup>74</sup>

The oath, referring to the temporalities of the see, was in common form throughout.<sup>75</sup> Thomas Cranmer, therefore, did not swear his protestation at the instigation of the crown.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Elton, P & P, pp. 180-2. The Articles are reprinted in Pocock, Rec. Ref., II, 523-31.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Elton, P & P, pp. 182-3. Cf. also P. Hughes, The Reformation in England, 3 vols (London, 1951-4), I, 336-7. The tract is printed in Strype, Eccl. Mem., I, ii, 162-75.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Elton, P & P, pp. 183-4. The tract is reprinted in Pocock, Rec. Ref., II, 539-52.

<sup>72</sup> Stat. Realm, III, 362-490. Cf. Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations, I, nos 136-45.

<sup>73</sup> P.R.O., C. 82. 667; L.P., VI, 417(27).

<sup>74</sup> B.L., Cotton MS. Cleopatra E. 6, fol. 251; L.P., VI, 291(3). Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 460.

<sup>75</sup> The oath has wrongly been annotated 'Kings Supremacy'. It

The government had dropped its plans to use the oath to enforce obedience from the bishops. In the appointment of Thomas Cranmer to Canterbury, moreover, the crown had everything to gain from the formal issue of a bull of provision from the Holy See. It seems that the government wished to claim the fullest possible authority for the court over which Cranmer was to preside to determine the 'divorce' of the King from Catherine of Aragon. Chapuys warned Charles V that this indeed was the reason for Cranmer's appointment.<sup>76</sup>

It seems, therefore, that the protestation stemmed from the dictates of the archbishop's own conscience. Foxe is probably correct when he reports that Cranmer informed the King of his scruples before his consecration. He told him that he could not accept the archbishopric of Canterbury at the hands of the Pope, for the King was 'the only supreme governor of the church of England, as well in causes ecclesiastical as temporal'. When the King asked Cranmer how he could prove the assertion, the archbishop elect cited several texts from Holy Scripture proving the supreme authority of Kings in their own realms.<sup>77</sup> It has already been shown that at the time of his elevation to Canterbury, Cranmer had indeed embraced the Scriptural principles upon which his concept of royal supremacy was to be based.<sup>78</sup>

---

is similar to that sworn by Edward Lee in 1531 as archbishop elect of York. Cf. Foedera, conventiones, literae et cuiuscunque generis acta publica inter reges Angliae et alios quosvis imperatores, reges, pontifices, compiled and edited in 20 vols by T. Rymer and R. Sanderson (London, 1704-35) XIV, 429.

<sup>76</sup> L.P., VI, 142.

<sup>77</sup> Foxe, A & M, VIII, 66.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. supra, pp. 116-18.

In his Commonplaces from the canon law, dating in their present form from the years 1533-5, Cranmer noted the oath of loyalty from a bishop to the see of Rome, only to reject it. The oath is noted in a form shorter than that which Cranmer himself swore:

Ego N. Episcopus ab hac hora in antea fidelis  
ero sancto Petro, sanotaeque Ro. ecclesiae,  
Dominoque Papae C ejusque successoribus  
canonicis intransitibus. Non ero neque in  
consilio neque in facto, ut vitam perdant  
aut membrum, vel capiat mala captione.  
Consilium, quod mihi aut per se, aut per  
litteras, aut per nuncium manifestabit, ad  
ejus damnum nulli pandam. Papatum, Romanae  
ecclesiae et regulas sanctorum Patrum  
adjutor ero ad defendendum et retinendum,  
(salvo ordine meo,) contra omnes homines.  
Vocatus ad synodum veniam, nisi praepeditus  
fuero canonica praepeditione. Legatum apost.  
se., quem certum esse cognovero, in eundo et  
redeundo honorifice tractabo, et in suis  
necessitatibus adjuvabo. Limina Apostolorum  
singulis annis aut per me aut per certum  
nuncium visitabo, nisi eorum absolvar licentia.  
Sic me Deus adjuvet et haec sancta evangelia.<sup>79</sup>

The effect of Cranmer's action in swearing the protestation is extremely difficult to determine. Legally, there can be little doubt that the archbishop committed perjury. Such

<sup>79</sup>Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 839-40: Ego.

a charge formed one of the chief objections against him at his trial at Oxford before bishop James Brokes in 1555. Dr Martin maintained:

He made a protestation one day, to keep never a whit of that which he would swear the next day. Was this the part of a christian man?<sup>80</sup>

In the months following Cranmer's consecration, Chapuys wrote to his master, Charles V, that the archbishop was a man suspected by all the world since he had violated his oath to the Pope.<sup>81</sup> Despite their wish to exploit the fact of Cranmer's papal provision, the government placed no great emphasis on Cranmer's formal oath to the Pope. In April 1533, the King told Cranmer that he was 'by Goddis callyng and owers, the moste pryncipall mynyster of our spirituall jurisdiction'.<sup>82</sup> It was not from ambition that Cranmer accepted the archbishopric following the issue of a bull of provision. He himself confessed that

there was never man came more unwillingly to a bishoprick than I did to that: insomuch that when king Henry did send for [me] in post, that I should come over, I prolonged my journey by seven weeks at the least, thinking that he would be forgetful of me in the mean time.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 216. Two reports of the trial survive. The official record Processus contra Thomam Cranmer is printed in P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 541-62. Foxe's account in English is reprinted in ibid., pp. 212-24. The two accounts correspond on numerous occasions. The list of sixteen questions posed during the examination is substantially identical in both accounts.

<sup>81</sup> L.P., VI, 465.

<sup>82</sup> St. P., I, 393; L.P., VI, 332.

<sup>83</sup> P.S. Cranmer II, loc. cit. Cranmer, Grindal and

It is clear that Cranmer took careful legal advice before he made his protest: 'That which I did, I did by the best learned men's advice that I could get at that time'.<sup>84</sup> He himself was certainly no lawyer. He once confessed that he possessed 'little skill in that behalf'.<sup>85</sup> Cranmer's protestation was certainly an expression of conscience, but he seems to have regarded it as more than that. When charged with perjury at his trial in Oxford, Cranmer retorted:

But I remember I saved all by protestation that I made by the counsel of the best learned men I could get at that time.<sup>86</sup>

Again, he told his judges:

He received(he said) a certain bull of the pope, which he delivered unto the king, and was archbishop by him.<sup>87</sup>

By his action in swearing the protestation, Cranmer sincerely believed that he was legally bound to accept papal jurisdiction only inasmuch as that authority was consonant with the Word of God.

That protest was used once more in the appointment of prelates to English sees. As late as November 1533, papal bulls of provision were still sought for the appointment of

---

Parker all displayed 'reasoned noli episcopare' on learning of their promotion to the see of Canterbury. Cf. P.N. Brooks, 'The Principle and Practice of Primitive Protestantism in Tudor England: Cranmer, Parker and Grindal as Chief Pastors 1535-1577' in Reformation Principle and Practice (London, 1980), pp. 122-3.

<sup>84</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, loc. cit.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., p. 265.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., p. 216.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., p. 219.

prelates to English sees. No such records appear in Thomas Cranmer's Register. On 4 November, John Salcote who was to be bishop of Bangor wrote to Cromwell:

The Pope's Holiness will, in no wise, graunt me the Bull, according to the tenor of my supplication to him made.<sup>88</sup>

Such intransigence by the papal consistory forced the crown to implement a new policy concerning episcopal appointments.

By December 1533, the process of capitular election and metropolitan confirmation for diocesan appointments was initiated.<sup>89</sup> On 27 August 1533, a bull of provision was issued at Rome for the appointment of Christopher Lord as bishop of Sidon for the diocese of Canterbury.<sup>90</sup> On 18 January 1534, 'in quadam galeria intra manerium reverendissimi patris domini Thome...de Lamhith', Christopher Lord, bishop of Sidon elect, swore the same protestation as that sworn by Thomas Cranmer in March 1533.<sup>91</sup> Some four weeks after

<sup>88</sup> St. P., I, 410; L.P., VI, 1396; cf. also St. P., VII, 520; L.P., VI, 1335.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 1567 and 1579.

<sup>90</sup> W. Stubbs, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum (Oxford, 1897), p. 203. Lord was dead by May 1534. Eubel, however, shows that Thomas Chetham was provided to the see of Sidon in 1526 for the diocese of Canterbury. Cf. C. Eubel et al., Hierarchia Catholica, vol. 1-(Padua, 1913-), III, p. 344. He was an assistant at the consecration of Nicholas Shaxton in 1535. Cf. Stubbs, op. cit., p. 99. Chetham was prebendary of Pancratius in St Paul's cathedral, London, during the period 1553-8. He was also active as a bishop in that diocese. He was dead by October 1558. Cf. Eubel, loc. cit. and J.M. Horn, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1541-1857, vol. 1 (London, 1969), p. 50. Cf. also H.B.C., p. 269. It seems that there were two bishops at the same time consecrated to the same see in partibus.

<sup>91</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 165v.-6.

Lord had sworn the protest, the statute abolishing the appointment of bishops by papal bulls was introduced into parliament.<sup>92</sup> In the government's eyes, Lord's act in swearing the protest was a measure simply designed to fulfil the needs of the immediate situation. If Cranmer himself doubted the legality of the protestation, it is difficult to see why he sanctioned its use in January 1534 when the oath of loyalty to the Holy See was shortly to be abolished.

The death of William Warham in 1532 provided the government with an opportunity to break the impasse concerning the King's marital cause. In appointing Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, the crown secured a prelate who was favourable to its cause. The papacy itself was powerless to prevent the appointment. Thomas Cranmer himself, however, seems to have felt that he could not swear the oath of loyalty to the Pope. The protestation which he made before his consecration was the result of a compromise reached between the government and the archbishop. Legally, Cranmer was guilty of perjury in swearing the protestation. He himself, however, seems to have believed that such an oath bound him






---

<sup>92</sup> The measure was introduced into parliament early in February 1534. It met opposition in the Lords, where the original measure was dropped. No copy of this first bill survives, but it is likely that it dealt with annates and episcopal elections. The final measure was passed in early March. Cf. SE. Lehberg, The Reformation Parliament 1529-1536 (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 190-1.



to obey the edicts of the Holy See only inasmuch as they were consonant with the Word of God. It was, indeed, a remarkable initiation to the problems of spiritual administration in diocese and province.

DIOCESE  
OF  
CANTERBURY  
according to the Valor Ecclesiasticus  
of 1535

-  division between dioceses of  
Canterbury and Rochester
-  Rural Deanery
-  Secular College
-  Diocesan Cathedral
-  Priority of Minster  
in Sheppey



Thomas Cranmer as bishop of the diocese of Canterbury

I would that...we might order our diocese in such sort, that neither paper, parchment, lead, nor wax, but the very christian conversation of the people might be the letters and seals of our offices, as the Corinthians were unto Paul...<sup>1</sup>

It is clear from Cranmer's letter to Cromwell of 1535 that the archbishop possessed a reformed spirituality of the highest order. As St Paul said of the Corinthians, the people of the diocese of Canterbury were to be 'Litterae nostrae et signa apostolatus nostri'.<sup>2</sup>

Given such a commitment, it is unfortunate that few records of diocesan jurisdiction survive within the archiepiscopal Register. No records of ordinations or of the grant of preaching licences exist there. Isolated preaching licences survive in the Registers of the faculty office.<sup>3</sup> In the diocese of London, separate ordinations Registers exist for the period 1550-1628.<sup>4</sup> Similar records exist for some of the new diocesan sees of the period. In Peterborough, established as a see from the archdeaconry of Northampton in Lincoln diocese, the act

---

<sup>1</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 305.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. D.S. Chambers, Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549 (Oxford, 1966), p. xxiv and n. 5.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. D.M. Smith, Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales (London, 1981), p. 149. Bonner's Register, however, still contains records of ordinations for the early years of the period covered by the separate Register. Cf. G.L. MS. 9531/12 pt 2, fols 319-21v.

books comprise institution and ordination books.<sup>5</sup> No such evidence exists for Canterbury diocese at this period.<sup>6</sup>

As diocesan bishop of the see of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer inherited an episcopal chancery which had developed throughout the previous centuries.<sup>7</sup> The diocese of Canterbury, consisting in the sixteenth century of a single archdeaconry, extended over the eastern part of Kent.<sup>8</sup> It possessed eight deaneries of immediate jurisdiction: the arches, Bocking, Croydon, Risborough, Shoreham, South Malling, Pagham and Tarring.<sup>9</sup> At the centre of the administrative machinery stood the archbishop himself. He was called upon to perform many duties throughout the province. Eighty-four extant letters for the year 1533 reveal an extensive itinerary.

Place of Composition	10	Westminster	Lambeth	Mortlake
Total		1	4	3

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-9.

<sup>6</sup>Dr Smith has shown, however, that two Registers exist for the archiepiscopate of William Laud which are clearly draft documents for certain portions of the main volumes; cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-4.

<sup>7</sup>The medieval development of the secretariat is analysed in C.R. Cheney, English Bishops' Chanceries 1100-1250 (Manchester, 1950), *passim*. For Canterbury diocese, a fundamental study is I.J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration, published in 2 vols for The Church Historical Society (London, 1933).

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>9</sup>A map of the diocese is located at the head of this chapter on p. 191. The areas of immediate jurisdiction are delineated on Ordnance Survey, Map of Monastic Britain: (South Sheet) 2nd ed. (1954).

Place of Composition	Dunstable	Croydon	Otford	Greenwich
Total	4	8	28	1

Place of Composition	Canterbury	Ford	None given
Total	1	3	31

Composition of letters by archbishop Thomas  
Cranmer for the year 1533

Both in and away from Lambeth, however, the archbishop maintained a firm influence over the archiepiscopal registry. Cranmer maintained close contact with his registrar. When a vacancy occurred in the college of South Malling in 1533 through the death of Richard Baylis, Cranmer ordered his registrar, William Pottkyns, to 'send unto me a collation thereof; and that your said collation have a window expedient to set what name I will therein'.<sup>11</sup> When Thomas Cromwell was concerned to investigate matters in Calais in 1539, Cranmer told him:

all such examinations, inquisitions, and other such writings as I have concerning any matters of Calyce, be in the hands and custody of my register, Anthony Hussey, unto whom I have direct my letters, that he shall with all expedition repair unto your lordship with all such writings...<sup>12</sup>

Similarly, the archbishop was careful to supervise the work of his chancellor. During the vacancy in the see of Coventry

<sup>10</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 237-76.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 249; cf. L.P.L., C.R., fol. 340v.

<sup>12</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 395.

and Lichfield in 1533, the archbishop became patron of a vacant vicarage. He gave the nomination of the promotion to the prior of Coventry and instructed his chancellor to 'dispatch the said prior according to your form devised by the law in that behalf...'.<sup>13</sup> The archbishop also supervised appointments to his diocesan and provincial courts. In 1533, for example, he instructed his chancellor 'that, according to the due form and manner of my licence...you do admit into the arches this bringer, Mr doctore Cave, a civilian...as shall be most convenient both for his state and degree therein'.<sup>14</sup> The archbishop sent a similar mandate to the dean of the arches 'inasmuch as I have admitted this bearer, Mr doctore Cave, for one of the arches, I will that you in like condition and effect do consider and take the same...'.<sup>15</sup> Clearly, the archbishop's concept of his office led him to supervise the work of his administrative officers in spiritual and administrative matters. Strictly legal concerns, however, he left to others. When one Pallgrave wrote to him concerning the first fruits of his benefice, Cranmer replied:

I will that you, for a final determination herein, do resort unto Pottekyns to know your end, to whom I have committed the ordering of all such matters belonging unto me: for you may right well consider, that I am neither skilled herein, nor that

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 259; the letter is addressed 'to master chancellor'.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 256; the mandate is similarly directed.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.: the mandate is addressed 'To master dean'.

it is convenient for me to meddle in  
such causes...<sup>16</sup>

An itinerary such as that of Thomas Cranmer was not uncommon among English prelates. Dr Joyce Horn has reconstructed the itinerary of Robert Hallum, bishop of Salisbury (1404-17). That prelate also travelled around his diocese, but Dr Horn has found that the bishop himself cared greatly for efficient administration. He has been described as 'virum valde industrium et etiam virtuosum'.<sup>17</sup> Dr Stephen Lander has shown that Robert Sherborne was resident at Chichester. By his personal presence, he was able to bring reform to his courts.<sup>18</sup>

The archbishop's supervision of the pattern of episcopal administration is also to be seen in the issue of commissions to his subordinate officers in diocese and province. When John Cokes died in 1546, he was described as dean of the arches and official of the court of Canterbury, auditor of causes, commissary general, chancellor, vicar general and master of the prerogative court of Canterbury.<sup>19</sup> The accumulation of such powers by Cokes is foreshadowed in the administration of William Warham, but no record exists of the issue of a commission to him at that time as either

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., pp. 263-4.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. The Register of Robert Hallum, Bishop of Salisbury 1407-17, edited by J.M. Horn (Canterbury and York Society, 72, 1977-9), pp. xiv and 235-9.

<sup>18</sup> S.J. Lander, The Diocese of Chichester 1508-1558: Episcopal Reform under Robert Sherburne and its Aftermath (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1974), pp. 24-93 and 375-8.

<sup>19</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 26.

official or dean.<sup>20</sup> A similar tendency is to be seen in the deaneries of immediate jurisdiction. On 14 October 1538, Richard Lyell was empowered to act as dean of Shoreham, Croydon, Bocking, Tarring, Pagham and Risborough. He was authorized to act in all ecclesiastical causes, to prove wills, to induct clerks into livings and to perform visitations.<sup>21</sup> This was not quite without mediaeval precedent. In 1501, archbishop Deane had conveyed upon Ralph Hanyes the same deaneries.<sup>22</sup> Although it is clear that all such appointments entailed the power to appoint deputies, Cranmer probably expected the officials to oversee their work as he himself attempted to supervise his own subordinates. In 1533, for example, the dean of the arches told him that Thomas Bedill 'hath such business, that he cannot intend to examine the witness concerning the matter in variance between the abbot of Tiltey and my lord of London's chaplain'. Since the dean attempted to 'stay in making out a commission', Cranmer told him testily 'I will that you appoint master Trygonell to be jointly with Mr Doctor Oliver, instead of Mr Bedell, in the said commission'.<sup>23</sup> The simplification of administrative practices, grounded in mediaeval precedent, stemmed from both financial and spiritual concerns. In 1539, the archbishop promised the next appointment as commissary of the faculties to his commissary general, Christopher Nevinson,

<sup>20</sup> Cf. I.J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration [henceforth cited as Administration], 2 vols (London, 1933), II, pp. 237-8, 240, 243 and 245.

<sup>21</sup> C.R., fol. 216v.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, p. 69.

<sup>23</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 261.



'who hath of me twenty marks by year, and can spend no penny'.<sup>24</sup>

On 17 March 1548, a commission was issued to Nevinson as commissary general.<sup>25</sup> It was granted for life, to run during the pontificate of the archbishop and his successors. He was empowered to practise in the consistory court of the diocese, to induct clerks into benefices and to receive clerici convicti from secular magistrates. He was also empowered to grant licences to parties who wished to marry so that the banns might be called once or twice, even if this should occur in times prohibited. He was to prove the wills of those who died within the diocese and of all those who possessed 'bona, iura sive credita' in more than one diocese, provided that the diocese of Canterbury be one in which the goods are held and that it be the place of death. He might exercise the powers of visitation and appoint rural deans, apparitors and others. The commission was ratified by the dean and chapter of Canterbury on 24 April.<sup>26</sup> When Robert Tayler was appointed as dean of South Malling on 10 May 1550, however, spiritual concerns were to the fore. His commission emphasised that the archbishop wished to fulfil the pastoral demands of his office by rooting out vices and sowing virtue. Tayler was to be appointed since the deanery

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 394.

<sup>25</sup> C.R., fols 62v.-3.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., fol. 63. Whilst Nevinson's commission was to run for life, all other commissions addressed to the commissary general during Cranmer's pontificate were issued at the archbishop's pleasure; cf. ibid., fols 17-v., 64-v. and 344v.

had all too long lacked an administrator to the injury of the people there.<sup>27</sup>

Throughout the twenty years of his archiepiscopate, Thomas Cranmer experienced bad relations with his cathedral chapter. Such a relationship is reflected in the administrative acta recorded in Thomas Cranmer's Register. An unpublished fragment of a letter from the archbishop dated at Lambeth on 10 December 1551 carefully emphasises the fact:

[I] desire you therefore to graunt your  
favour[a]ble consente unt[o] my said servaunt  
for the due [con]firmat[io]n therof under  
your chapiter seale so as the same may be of  
f[o]rce and effecte accordingly...<sup>28</sup>

Delays in ratifying appointments might cause friction between the archbishop and the chapter. Nicholas Wotton was appointed as commissary of the faculties on 16 October 1538. The appointment was not formally ratified until 8 December 1541.<sup>29</sup>

Throughout the 1530s, the chapter at Canterbury was in disgrace following its involvement in the affair of the Nun of Kent.<sup>30</sup> The archbishop was forced to act as intercessor for them to the King:

[the] prior and his brethren...considering  
the matter sounding to your grace's  
displeasure...have desired me very instantly

<sup>27</sup> C.R., fol. 216v.

<sup>28</sup> C.C.A.L., Christ Church Letters, mounted in three scrap books, vol. III, no. 2. The reconstruction is editorial.

<sup>29</sup> C.C.A.L., Register U, fol. 11. The commission alone is recorded in L.P.L., C.R., fol. 217.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. P. Clark, English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution: Religion, Politics and Society in Kent 1500-1640 (Hassocks, 1977), p. 35.

had all too long lacked an administrator to the injury of the people there.<sup>27</sup>

Throughout the twenty years of his archiepiscopate, Thomas Cranmer experienced bad relations with his cathedral chapter. Such a relationship is reflected in the administrative acta recorded in Thomas Cranmer's Register. An unpublished fragment of a letter from the archbishop dated at Lambeth on 10 December 1551 carefully emphasises the facts:

[I] desire you therefore to graunt your  
favour[a]ble consente unt[o] my said servaunt  
for the due [con]firmat[io]n therof under  
your chapiter seale so as the same may be of  
f[o]rce and effecte accordingly...<sup>28</sup>

Delays in ratifying appointments might cause friction between the archbishop and the chapter. Nicholas Wotton was appointed as commissary of the faculties on 16 October 1538. The appointment was not formally ratified until 8 December 1541.<sup>29</sup>

Throughout the 1530s, the chapter at Canterbury was in disgrace following its involvement in the affair of the Nun of Kent.<sup>30</sup> The archbishop was forced to act as intercessor for them to the King:

[the] prior and his brethren...considering  
the matter sounding to your grace's  
displeasure...have desired me very instantly

<sup>27</sup> C.R., fol. 216v.

<sup>28</sup> C.C.A.L., Christ Church Letters, mounted in three scrap books, vol. III, no. 2. The reconstruction is editorial.

<sup>29</sup> C.C.A.L., Register U, fol. 11. The commission alone is recorded in L.P.L., C.R., fol. 217.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. P. Clark, English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution: Religion, Politics and Society in Kent 1500-1640 (Hassocks, 1977), p. 35.

to be a mediator for them to your most noble majesty...<sup>31</sup>

After the dissolution, the position was no better. In a set of thirty-eight visitation articles, the archbishop attempted to discover abuses in the cathedral establishment.<sup>32</sup> The resulting injunctions reveal significant lapses.<sup>33</sup> The clerks were ordered to observe all injunctions issued by the King himself and by the archbishop. Prebendaries and others should 'sit in the chapter-house at the sermons made there, and no where else'. Prebendaries should cause to be preached two sermons each year in churches appropriated to the cathedral. Each unbeneficed preacher should be resident at Canterbury for at least six months. In 1546, Cranmer had advised the chapter that their statutes did not forbid prebendaries to exchange houses.<sup>34</sup> The injunctions of 1550, however, seek to curb the excesses in such a practice. Similarly, the back doors of all prebendaries' houses into the city should 'be clearly shut up'.

It was the prerogative of the metropolitanical church to claim that no bishop in the southern province should be consecrated without a special licence from the prior and

---

<sup>31</sup>P.S., Cranmer II. p. 271.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., pp. 159-61.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 161-2.

<sup>34</sup>C.C.A.L., Register U, fol. 157v.; printed in P.S., Cranmer II. p. 417. Cox has dated the letter to 1546, although the cartularies of the dean and chapter assign no year to the missive. The position of the letter in Register U, however, does suggest 1546 as the year of composition. The prebendaries' plot of 1543 likewise reveals the bad relationship which existed

chapter. In the later sixteenth century, the fee for this was 26s 8d.<sup>35</sup> The latter might also claim the consecration cope, or a composition for it.<sup>36</sup> Where the records of the consecration of diocesan and suffragan bishops have survived, it is clear that no bishop was consecrated at Canterbury during Thomas Cranmer's archiepiscopate. The same is true of Warham's pontificate. Between 1509 and 1533, no diocesan bishop appears to have been consecrated there.<sup>37</sup> Eight licences are recorded as being issued between 1533 and 1540 for the consecrations of Goodrich to Ely, Lee to Coventry and Lichfield, Saloot to Bangor, Shaxton to Salisbury, Bell to Worcester, Heath to Rochester, Skip to Hereford and Bonner to London.<sup>38</sup> Following the dissolution of the monastery in 1540 and its re-foundation as a secular cathedral, no such licences are registered in the cathedral cartularies. It is unclear if they were discontinued.

The dissolution of the cathedral priory was itself the greatest break in the mediaeval pattern of ecclesiastical administration. Cromwell's proposed order for the new establishment envisaged a large foundation of over 160 members, including a provost, twelve prebendaries, six preachers, five readers, twenty students to be maintained at

---

between the archbishop and the chapter. Cf. L.P., XVIII, ii, no. 546. Cf. also J. Ridley, Thomas Cranmer (Oxford, 1962), pp 229-45. Cf. also Clark, op. cit., pp. 57-66.

<sup>35</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fol. 80.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. W. Stubbs, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, 2nd ed (Oxford, 1897), pp. 96-104.

<sup>38</sup>Cf. C.C.A.L., Register T2, fols 8v., 9, 9-v., 25v.-6, 146v.-7, 165, 169 and 176-v.

Oxford and Cambridge and sixty scholars to be taught grammar and logic in Hebrew, Greek and Latin.<sup>39</sup> On 29 November 1539, the archbishop told Cromwell in a letter that the establishment of prebendaries at £40 each per annum should be changed. A prebendary 'is neither a learner, nor teacher, but a good viander'. They attempt 'to be chief, and to bear all the whole rule and preeminence'. Admitting that in the beginning prebendaries and monks were to pursue a worthy life, Cranmer nonetheless asserted that both degrees should be banished together. Concerning the estate of a prebendary, 'St Paul, reckoning up the degree and estates allowed in his time, could not find [it] in the church of Christ'. Cranmer suggested instead the establishment of 'twenty divines at £10 apiece, like as it is appointed to be at Oxford and Cambridge: and forty students in the tongues, and sciences, and French, to have 10 marks apiece'. In short, the archbishop wished his cathedral to become a seat of learning like the two universities.<sup>40</sup> The eventual foundation took no note of Cranmer's ideas. It was to have a dean, twelve prebendaries, six preachers and twelve minor canons.<sup>41</sup> Cranmer suggested Edward Crome, an ardent reformer, as the new dean.<sup>42</sup> Thomas Goldwell, the former prior, also petitioned for the post.<sup>43</sup> Nicholas Wotton, however, was

---

<sup>39</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 398.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 396-7.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. L.P.L., C.R., fol. 53v.-4v.

<sup>42</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 397; cf. D.N.B., sub nomine.

<sup>43</sup>L.P., XV, 254.

appointed.<sup>44</sup> He was a royal servant; in 1546 he was granted a dispensation to hold at one time the deaneries of Canterbury and York.<sup>45</sup> In 1551, he was granted a licence from the privy council to partake in the appointment of all officers despite the fact that he was away on embassy.<sup>46</sup> In the ill-fated Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, the archbishop presented a modified version of his plan. Prebendaries were to ensure that a learned man be appointed to give a lecture in divinity three times a week, which they were to attend. If a man outside the establishment were to be appointed, the £20 was to be provided by each prebendary or from the common fund.<sup>47</sup> Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's attempts to achieve ecclesiastical reform during his pontificate were based on Scriptural exegesis. That he failed to instil such reform in the members of his cathedral church was an ominous sign of the powers of the conservative forces ranged against him and of the King as supreme head.

Little survives in the archiepiscopal Register concerning the archbishop's jurisdiction over monastic houses and secular colleges in the diocese. Important light, however, is shed upon the early history of the royal visitation of the friars. On 6 February 1538, Richard Yngworth, suffragan bishop of Dover, received a commission to visit all the houses of friars in the realm. The commission was

---

<sup>44</sup>The value of the deanery which Wotton possessed at Canterbury was £300 per annum; cf. C.R., fol. 53v.-4v.

<sup>45</sup>C.C.A.L., Register U, fol. 149-v.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., fol. 246.

<sup>47</sup>E. Cardwell, Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum (Oxford, 1850), p. 103.



delivered in confirmation of letters patent granted by Thomas Cromwell as Vice-Gerent.<sup>48</sup> Essentially, his powers were those of monastic visitation and he was granted power to inhibit the provincials of each of the four orders of friars. In an unusual clause, the visitor was empowered to compel secular officials to help him in his visitation:

mandantes omnibus et singulis vicecomitibus,  
maioribus, bellivis ac quibuscumque aliis  
officiariis ministris et subditis nostris  
quatenus tibi in [et] circa premissorum  
executionem effectualiter assistant et  
suffragentur.

Little is known of the beginning of Yngworth's visitation. On 7 April, he was in Suffolk conducting a visitation of the Grey Friars at Ipswich.<sup>49</sup> Six days earlier, lord Wentworth the hereditary founder wrote to the Vice-Gerent concerning the friary. He told Cromwell that through poverty the house had sold jewels belonging to the friary. The warden there maintained that in the previous twelve months, they could not raise £5 in income and that their house would not survive. Wentworth pointed out to Cromwell that friaries were a hypocritical weed planted by the bishop of Rome. Alleging that he wished to verify Christ's saying 'Omnis plantatio quem non plantavit Pater meus eradicabitur', he has attempted to purchase property from the house.<sup>50</sup> Although Yngworth's commission did not empower him to take

<sup>48</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 16; Wilkins, Concilia, III, pp. 829-30; of. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 5.

<sup>49</sup> L.P., XIII 1, 699.

<sup>50</sup> L.P., XIII 1, 651.



inventories of property, he nevertheless drew up an inventory of the possessions of the Grey Friars.<sup>51</sup> Yngworth listed possessions in the choir, vestry, kitchen, buttery, garner, cheese house, the warden's chamber, his upper and lower chambers, the vice-warden's chamber and another house.<sup>52</sup> The contents of the bakehouse and millhouse are noted as appearing upon a separate inventory.<sup>53</sup> All these appurtenances were carefully locked away.<sup>54</sup> More significantly, plate and fabrics which were alienated were restored by the visitor. The total weight of plate restored was 260 oz. The plate was in the keeping of the visitor, the fabrics of William Lawrence.<sup>55</sup> A separate inventory listed property remaining with the Grey Friars for their immediate use. The inventory listed goods in the choir, the church, the vestry, the chamber for the use of the servants of lord Wentworth, brewery, mill-house, frater and elsewhere.<sup>56</sup>

Attempts by friars to alienate goods from various houses led to the issue of a second commission on 5 May.<sup>57</sup> Since friars 'profuse et insolenter dilapidarunt, vendiderunt et alienarunt' goods 'tam mobilia quam imobilia', Yngworth was empowered to sequester convent seals and to draw up inventories of goods, placing them in safe care. Cromwell's

<sup>51</sup> P.R.O., E 36 vol. 153, fols 64-9v.; L.P., XIII, 1, 699. The inventory was drawn up on 7 April 1538.

<sup>52</sup> P.R.O., E 36 vol. 153, fols 64-7.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., fol. 65v.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., fol. 67.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., fols 67v.-8v.

<sup>56</sup> P.R.O., SP 1/141, fols 226-7; L.P., XIII, 11, Appendix 16.

<sup>57</sup> C.R., fol. 16-v. Cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 6.

approach at this stage of the visitation was still tentative. On 23 May, Yngworth told the Vice-Gerent that in places he had visited he had caused indentures to be drawn up and seals sequestered. Before the year was out, most of the friars would have surrendered.<sup>58</sup> The slowness of this method of enforcing submission did not appeal to the Vice-Gerent. Between 23 May and 28 July, Cromwell accused Yngworth of sympathizing with the friars. Yngworth was stung by the attack. In a letter to Cromwell, he protested that he had lost his friar's heart two years before his habit. He maintained that he had never known Cromwell's true wishes. Now that these were clear, he was free to proceed.<sup>59</sup> Yngworth now girded his loins for the task, resolving to enforce more effectively the judicial and administrative powers laid down in his commissions. A report of the mayor and aldermen of Gloucester, dated 28 July 1538, shows how Yngworth's clever plan was implemented. Yngworth issued a stringent set of injunctions to each house. Being unable to comply with them, the friars were enforced to submit voluntarily.<sup>60</sup> Such was the confusion concerning the commissions that Yngworth had not ordered them to be copied. On Friday 12 July, he appeared in St Paul's cathedral before John Cokes, the archbishop's official principal, who was sitting judicially beneath the crucifix on the north door:

---

<sup>58</sup> L.P., XIII, i, 1053.

<sup>59</sup> L.P., XIII, i, 1484. Cf. D. Knowles, The Religious Orders in England, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1948-59), III, p. 361.

<sup>60</sup> L.P., XIII, i, 1484(3); cf. Knowles, loc. cit.

...comparuit reverendus pater dominus  
Richardus, episcopus suffraganeus Doveriensis,  
et presentavit domino binas litteras  
commissionales...quas dixit se non habere  
duplicatas. Quare petiit eas exemplari,  
decerni et fidem non minorem adhibendam  
eisdem decretis in quam litteris ipsis  
originalibus. Quas dictus officialis ad  
eius petitionem decrevit publicandas...<sup>61</sup>

The publication of the two commissions sealed ad causas ecclesiasticas was crucial to the visitation then in progress.

The enforcement of the powers laid down in the commissions enabled Yngworth to receive the voluntary surrender of the houses. The routine task of copying such documents by the archbishop's subordinates became an act of great import for the voluntary surrender of the houses became the pivot around which Yngworth's policy of suppression now turned.

The spiritual reforms of the archbishop and the political settlement of the 1530s led to further modifications in the mediaeval pattern of ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the diocese. From the early 1540s, Cranmer was a proponent of the reformed idea of the priesthood of all believers. His sacramental Commonplace Books in the British Library give evidence for his views at this date:

Non autem de solis episcopis et presbiteris  
dictum est, qui proprie vocantur in ecclesia  
sacerdotes, sed sicut omnes Christi dicimur  
propter mysticum chrisma, sic omnes sacerdotes...<sup>62</sup>

<sup>61</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 16v.; of. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 7.

<sup>62</sup> B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fol. 189v.

The quotation from Bede shows how fully the archbishop had come to accept the idea. In 1544, an attempt was made to pass in parliament a statute allowing laymen to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Such an attempt, however, was not successful. Professor Lehmberg has suggested that Cranmer may have sponsored the affair. The statute was eventually passed in 1545.<sup>63</sup> Although nothing survives among the archbishop's papers concerning the statute, it is likely that he supported the attempt to secure such an act. On Sunday 28 February 1546, the archbishop appointed William Cooke to several important offices:

claro viro Magistro Willelmo Coke,  
laico et coniugato, legum doctori, tunc  
coram eo presenti, et de renunciando Romano  
pontifice etc...ad sancta Dei evangelia  
iurato, supradicto de archibus, ac audiencie  
et prerogativa officia per eum ad suum  
beneplacitum exercenda...contulit atque  
ipsum Magistrum Willelmum officialem,  
decanum de archibus, auditorem, officialem  
principalem et commissarium prerogative  
sue constituit et iurisdictionem...iuxta  
statutum anno xxxvii<sup>mo</sup> eiusdem domini nostri  
Regis pro iurisdictione ecclesiastica per  
laicos exercenda commisit...<sup>64</sup>

If the archbishop's spiritual and administrative reforms led to changes within his diocesan registry, the

<sup>63</sup> Stat. Realm. III, 1009. In 1542, the bill was read once in parliament and convocation rejected it. In 1545, however, convocation was not consulted. Cf. S.E. Lehmberg, The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII 1536-47 (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 162-3 and 224.

<sup>64</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 26-v.; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 33, where textual variants are given in the footnotes.

political settlement of the 1530s was equally important in this respect. Under mediaeval patterns of ecclesiastical administration, jurisdiction over Calais and the neighbouring areas fell to the archbishop of Canterbury by a papal grant from Urban VI of December 1379.<sup>65</sup> Following the extirpation of Roman jurisdiction in England, however, the archbishop of Canterbury still claimed to administer the territory by virtue of the King's supremacy over the English church. On 20 May 1540, Robert Harvy received a commission as commissary general in Calais. The preamble ran:

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus, ad  
quem omnis et omnimoda jurisdictio spiritualis  
et ecclesiastica in villa Calesie, aliisque  
locis circumvicinis Morinensis diocesis sub  
obediencia excellentissimi in Christo  
principis et domini domini Henrici [etc.]  
in terra supremi capitis Anglicane ecclesie  
ubilibet constitutis, mediante auctoritate  
eiusdem domini nostri Regis dinoscitur  
notorie pertinere...<sup>66</sup>

The commission was issued 'Deputato deputando' following the arrest of the lord deputy, lord Lisle.<sup>67</sup> There seems to have been some confusion, however, as to the exact status of the territory. Some of the institutions recorded in the

<sup>65</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 508-9. In June 1421, Chichele renounced the Calais jurisdiction. He resumed it by 1440 and it is clear that his authority still stemmed from the papal grant. Cf. ibid., pp. 514 and 516-18.

<sup>66</sup> C.R., fol. 22v.; cf. ibid., fols 39v.-40.

<sup>67</sup> The Lisle Letters, edited in 6 vols by M. St Clare Byrne, (Chicago, 1981), VI, pp. 117-18. For a description of Calais and the pale, cf. H.A. Dillon, 'Calais and the Pale' in Archaeologia, vol. 53 pt 2 (Second Series vol. III pt 2), pp. 289-388.

the archiepiscopal Register reveal that the churches of the town and marches were regarded as lying in the diocese of Thérouanne(diocesis Morinensis) and province of Canterbury.<sup>68</sup> Others record that Calais was part of the diocese of Canterbury.<sup>69</sup> Most of the records of institutions to benefices, however, record that the Calais jurisdiction was an immediate jurisdiction of Christ Church Canterbury.<sup>70</sup> The same is true of the six institutions made to the territory 'infra conquestum agri Boloniensis' made between December 1546 and 1547.<sup>71</sup> It is unclear if the commissary general of Calais exercised jurisdiction over the territory. Where the place of institution is noted, it is Lambeth and the mandate from the archbishop for induction is addressed to 'universis' or 'universis rectoribus' in each case.

Dr Peter Heath has shown that in the century preceding the appointment of Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, the archiepiscopal Registers for Canterbury diocese record the purgations of only eight criminous clerks under the provisions of canon law.<sup>72</sup> Under Thomas Cranmer, the commissary general was empowered to claim such clerks from secular magistrates. The powers are included in three

<sup>68</sup> C.R., fols 376v., 384v., 389-90.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., fols 360v. and 366.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., fols 354v.-5, 357v., 361, 362-v., 373v., 377, 380v. 383-5v., 409v., 417, 418v., 421v. and 422v.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., fols 404v.-5. In each case, the crown was patron of the living.

<sup>72</sup> The Registers of Stafford, Kempe, and Bourghier record no purgations, that of Morton six, Deane's none and Warham's two. Five of the purgations recorded under archbishop Morton occurred during a vacancy in the see of Salisbury, one during a vacancy in the see of Bath and Wells. Cf. P. Heath, The English Parish Clergy on the Eve of the Reformation (London, 1969), p. 212.

of the four extant commissions. Such commissions were issued to Christopher Nevinson in 1538 and 1548 and Thomas Smythe in 1551.<sup>73</sup> This was essentially a continuation of mediaeval practices.<sup>74</sup> In reality, commissions continued to be issued to a variety of people.<sup>75</sup> During the twenty years of Cranmer's archiepiscopate, records exist concerning the conviction by secular magistrates of seventeen such men.<sup>76</sup> In eight cases, nothing survives beyond the indictment or conviction before secular courts. Compurgations were made in seven more. Not one of those undergoing purgation was a clerk in major orders. William Curtney alias Curtnall was a goldsmith at Canterbury.<sup>77</sup> John Sowtham of Gravesend, Henry Hunt of Staplehurst and John Warde are described as labourers.<sup>78</sup> George Coplewood of Southwark and Ferdinand de Naples of London were both yeomen.<sup>79</sup> Such clerks were in fact laymen claiming beneficium clericale. Where the method of pleading clergy is recorded, it seems to have consisted in a simple test of literacy. At the gaol delivery held in Canterbury on 17 May 1543, Curtney claimed that he was a clerk and read from

<sup>73</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 17-v., 62v.-3 and 64-v.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, 525. Dr Churchill found an early commission to the commissary general to claim clerks in 1326; cf. ibid., p. 525 n. 5.

<sup>75</sup> C.R., fols 427-33. Cf. also Churchill, Administration, I, p. 525.

<sup>76</sup> C.R., fols 19v.-20, 50-1v., and 427-33.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., fol. 427v. For the practice of purgation, cf. D.M. Owen, The Records of the Established Church in England (London, 1970), pp. 38 and 40.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., fols 427v.-8.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., fol. 431-31A.

a book as a clerk. He was then handed over to Thomas Smythe, the archbishop's commissary, as a clericus convictus.<sup>80</sup> All this was a continuation of mediaeval practice.<sup>81</sup> The crimes committed by such men were usually those of theft. Curtney was indicted for having stolen a leather bag containing £40 from the goods of Robert Naylor, alderman.<sup>82</sup> Where purgation was allowed, objectors to the compurgation had first to be cited. In the surviving examples, no instance of objection is recorded. It is clear that once purgation was allowed, the clerk rarely failed to obtain release. A clerk might lose the privilege of benefit of clergy by being bigamus. A man was said to be bigamus if he had married more than once; he might also have married a widow or other non-virgin. The council of Lyons in 1274, following a long canonical tradition, excluded bigami from all clerical privileges. The rule was also embodied in secular law. After 1344, an ordinary was to hold an inquest to determine whether the clerk in question was bigamous.<sup>83</sup> The question of bigamy was the principle at stake in the case of Thomas Bocher, butcher, from Buxted in Sussex. At a gaol delivery held at East Grinstead in 1541, the archbishop's Register records that Bocher was found guilty of unspecified felonies.

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., fol. 427v.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Heath, op. cit., pp. 128 and 121.

<sup>82</sup> C.R., loc. cit.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. R.E. Rhodes, Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church (Notre Dame, 1982), pp. 32-3.



Bocher asserted that he was a clerk and claimed benefit of clergy. It was immediately asserted by Anthony Browne, acting on behalf of the court, that on 10 July 1534 Bocher had married Maud Hollywell, widow, at Uckfield and was therefore a bigamist.<sup>84</sup> Eventually, a commission was issued to Robert Peterson, dean of South Malling, to investigate the case of alleged bigamy. The witnesses at the inquisition declared that Bocher was married in the chapel of Uckfield in May, June or July 1536 or 1537; the ceremony was performed by Richard Morpeth, curate.<sup>85</sup> Nothing else survives concerning the case.

Under Henry VIII, radical changes were made in the rules concerning benefit of clergy. Statutes took away the right of clerks in minor orders to claim benefit at all.<sup>86</sup> Theoretically, no clerk in minor orders should have been able to plead his clergy. Thomas Cranmer's Register, however, records five purgations before 1547.<sup>87</sup> Under Edward VI, the severity of such statutes was mitigated. There was a partial restoration of benefit of clergy following the passage of the Treason Act of 1547.<sup>88</sup> The Vagrancy Act of the same year, however, laid down that from henceforth purgation might be made only one year after conviction.

<sup>84</sup> C.R., fol. 19v.; cf. ibid., fols 19v.-20.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., fols 50-1v.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. W. Holdsworth, A History of English Law, 17 vols (London, 1938-72), III (Fifth ed.), pp. 299-302.

<sup>87</sup> C.R., fols 427-33; cf. Heath, op. cit., pp. 126-7. Cf. also Rodes, op. cit., pp. 86-7.

<sup>88</sup> Holdsworth, loc. cit. It soon became necessary to deprive certain offences of benefit of clergy once more.

Within that time, a clerk should find a man to be bound to the ordinary for £20 to use the clerk as his slave for one year. Two clerks were so treated during Cranmer's pontificate. Robert Cookeson's felony is not specified, but George Gowre had stolen £32.<sup>89</sup> The evidence within the Register usefully shows that the harsh Vagrancy Act was in fact enforced.<sup>90</sup> The act itself was repealed in 1549.<sup>91</sup>

Blackstone praised the laws which governed benefit of clergy. He clearly failed to understand the abuses prevalent within the English legal system at that time.<sup>92</sup> During the episcopate of Thomas Cranmer, the archbishop's officials continued to operate a system which was already obsolete.<sup>92</sup>

The historical kernel of all episcopal Registers is the record of institutions and collations within the diocese.<sup>93</sup> Thomas Cranmer's Register has a very full record for the years of his archiepiscopate.<sup>94</sup> 594 records of institutions and collations in the diocese or deaneries

<sup>89</sup> Cf. C.R., fols 430-1. An unpublished letter in English from the archbishop to his official principal is recorded in ibid., fol. 430. Cf. Stat. Realm, IV, 1, pp. 5-6. For a discussion of this act, cf. C.S.L. Davies, 'Slavery and Protector Somerset; the Vagrancy Act of 1547' in The Economic History Review, Second Series, vol. XIX (nos 1-3, 1966), pp. 533-49.

<sup>90</sup> For a contrary view, cf. ibid., pp. 545-8 and G.R. Elton, Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558 (London, 1977), pp. 341-2.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Stat. Realm, IV, 1, pp. 115-17.

<sup>92</sup> Holdsworth, loc. cit. Benefit of clergy was not finally abolished until 1827.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Smith, Registers, p. ix.

<sup>94</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 339-426v.

of immediate jurisdiction reveal that large numbers of priests remained in their livings until death.

Death	61.8%
Resignation or Permutation	34.5%
Deprivation	1.2%
Attainder	0.7%
None given	1.9%

Reasons for vacancies in promotions in the diocese and peculiars of Canterbury 1533-53 expressed as a percentage of all vacancies

The records have recently been studied by Dr Michael Zell.<sup>95</sup> The figures given above are significantly different from those in the Register of Thomas Bourghier, archbishop of Canterbury (1454-86). Professor du Boulay has calculated that there are 870 institutions to benefices in the diocese and deaneries of immediate jurisdiction. In addition, there are 56 institutions to benefices in other dioceses and 88 exchanges. Professor du Boulay found that the main reason for vacancies during Bourghier's episcopate was resignation.

---

<sup>95</sup> M.L. Zell, 'The personnel of the clergy in Kent, in the Reformation period' in English Historical Review, LXXXIX (July, 1974), pp. 525-7. Dr Michael Zell included only the deanery of Shoreham in his assessment of promotions in the deaneries of immediate jurisdiction.

Death 39.4%

Resignation or

Permutation 45.9%

Reasons for vacancies in promotions recorded in<sup>96</sup>  
Thomas Bourghier's Register expressed as a  
percentage of all vacancies

The reason for the decrease in vacancies by resignation during Thomas Cranmer's archiepiscopate is surely financial. The statute of 1534 annexing first fruits and tenths to the crown demanded that one year's revenue should be payable to the King as first fruits from all incumbents.<sup>97</sup> Dr Zell estimated the percentage of vacancies due to death in Thomas Cranmer's archiepiscopate at more than 66.7%, but he gave no figures to support his claim.<sup>98</sup> The Registers of Stephen Gardiner and John Ponet at Winchester(1531-53) show that 68.2% of all vacancies during the period were due to death whilst only 28.1% were due to the resignation of the incumbent.<sup>99</sup> Thomas Cranmer's Register also shows that

<sup>96</sup> Registrum Thome Bourghier, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi. A.D. 1454-1486. ed. by F.R.H. du Boulay(Canterbury and York Society, 54, 1957), pp. xxxviii-ix.

<sup>97</sup> Stat. Realm. III, pp. 493-9. Cf. F. Heal, 'Clerical tax collection under the Tudors: the influence of the Reformation' in Continuity and Change, ed. by R O'Day and F. Heal(Leicester, 1976), pp. 103-11.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Zell, art. cit., p. 525.

<sup>99</sup> Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynt, episcoporum Wintoniensium, transcribed and edited by H. Chitty and H.E. Malden (Canterbury and York Society, 37, 1930), p. xxxii. The total number of institutions recorded in the episcopal Registers is 377. Although the records in the Registers are probably

six clerks were deprived and four attainted.<sup>100</sup>

Equally important for the patterns of clerical promotion is an assessment of the number of graduates promoted throughout the period. For the archiepiscopate of Thomas Bourghier, Professor du Boulay has calculated the number of graduates whose activity can be traced in that bishop's Register. Of the clergy who were instituted or already beneficed in Bourghier's time, about 21% were graduates.<sup>101</sup> Dr Michael Kelly has calculated that during the archiepiscopate of Henry Chichele (1414-43) only 9% of the total number of clerks instituted were graduates. For the archiepiscopate of William Warham, the figure is 39%.<sup>102</sup> The records within Thomas Cranmer's Register show that at least 30.5% of all clerks promoted were graduates.<sup>103</sup> In a study of the diocese of Chichester, Dr Lander has found

---

incomplete, the proportion of vacancies by death compared to those by resignation is not necessarily inaccurate. Dr Margaret Bowker found a similar picture in the diocese of Lincoln. In the archdeaconsries of Bedford, Buckingham and Huntingdon between 1526 and 1543, the percentage of incumbents staying in their parishes was 30.8%, 28% and 26% respectively. Cf. M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: The Diocese of Lincoln under John Longland 1521-1547 (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 126 and 187.

<sup>100</sup> Dr Zell gives the figures as three deprivations and two attainders. Cf. Zell, loc. cit. For the revised figures for deprivations, cf. C.R., fols 351, 366, 378, 395, 395v. and 411. For a case of disputed deprivation, cf. ibid., fols 406v. and 422v. For the attainted clerks, cf. fols 355-v., 383-v. and 384.

<sup>101</sup> Registrum Thome Bourghier. Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi. A.D. 1454-1486, ed. by F.R.H. du Boulay (Canterbury and York Society, 54, 1957), p. xxxix.

<sup>102</sup> M.J. Kelly, Canterbury Jurisdiction and Influence during the episcopate of William Warham. 1503-32 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1963), pp. 15-17.

<sup>103</sup> Dr Zell suggested that the figure was 25%. Cf. Zell, art. cit., p. 525.

that the percentage of graduates promoted to benefices during Sherborne's episcopate(1508-36) was 36%. In the pontificates of Sampson, Day and Scory(1536-56), the figure is only 17%.<sup>104</sup> Dr Oxley has made similar calculations for the county of Essex.

1520-9	29%
1530-9	27%
1540-9	17%
1550-9	7%

Number of graduates instituted in Essex during the period 1536-56 expressed as a percentage of all institutions.<sup>105</sup>

Whilst the percentage of graduates instituted to benefices during Thomas Cranmer's archiepiscopate is high, the figure is not as large as that for the pontificate of his predecessor. In part, financial considerations explain such statistics for Cranmer's pontificate. Dr Zell has shown that the average value of a benefice in Canterbury diocese was £12 per annum, although 46% were worth more than £10.<sup>106</sup> The figures for graduate presentations, however, cannot be taken as an indication of the number of resident clergy in parishes. Dr Bowker has shown that between 1514 and

<sup>104</sup> S.J. Lander, The Diocese of Chichester, 1508-1558: Episcopal Reform under Robert Sherburne and its Aftermath (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1974), p. 204.

<sup>105</sup> The figures are taken from J.E. Oxley, The Reformation in Essex to the death of Mary(Manchester, 1965), p. 265.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Zell, art. cit., p. 529 n. 1.

and 1520/1 over 35% of all non-residents in Lincoln diocese were graduates.<sup>107</sup>

The numbers of clerks known to be graduates and who were collated to livings by the archbishop can also be calculated. For the archiepiscopate of Thomas Cranmer, the figure is 48.2%. For the pontificate of Henry Chichele, the figure is only 26%. During the episcopate of William Warham, the percentage of the archbishop's collations awarded to clerks known to be graduates is 66.7%.<sup>108</sup> For the episcopate of Thomas Goodrich at Ely (1534-54), the figure is 69.2%.<sup>109</sup> Cranmer certainly wished to promote graduates who could work in administrative positions in diocese and province. In 1534, Thomas Cranmer collated his brother to the archdeaconry of Canterbury and to the provostship of Wingham.<sup>110</sup> Edmund Cranmer was a master of arts and remained as archdeacon until his deprivation in 1554.<sup>111</sup> Dr Peter Clark has shown how Thomas Cranmer used his patronage to appoint reformist clergy in his diocese.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Cf. M. Bowker, The Secular Clergy in the diocese of Lincoln 1495-1520 (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 97 and 193-213.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Kelly, op. cit., pp. 18-20.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. F. Heal, The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period: C.A. 1515-1600 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1972), p. 80.

<sup>110</sup> C.R., fols 343v.-4 and 347-50.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, IV, p. 9. Cf. also Grace Books of Cambridge University, ed. by S.M. Leathes and M. Bateson, 4 vols in 5 (Cambridge, 1897-1910), Grace Book I, p. 180.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. P. Clark, English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution: Religion, Politics and Society in Kent, 1500-1640 (Hassocks, 1977), p. 36.

Cranmer continued to use his powers in this way. John Scory was appointed sixth preacher at the reconstituted foundation at Canterbury. He received a B.D. degree from Cambridge in 1539 and was chaplain to the archbishop. He was bishop of Rochester in 1551-2 and bishop of Chichester in 1552-3.<sup>113</sup> John Ponet received a D.D. degree in 1547.<sup>114</sup> The archbishop made him one of his chaplains. He was collated as rector of St Michael's, Crooked Lane, in London in 1543. In 1545, he was collated as rector of East Lavant in Sussex. He became a canon at Canterbury in 1546 and vicar of Ashford in 1547.<sup>115</sup> He was bishop of Rochester in 1550-1 and replaced Gardiner at Winchester in 1551. Through his patronage, Cranmer strove to make his see a model diocese in terms of the preferment of reformist clergy.

Thomas Cranmer's Register also yields important information concerning the changing patterns of patronage within the diocese. Dr Michael Zell has shown that the

---

<sup>113</sup>J. and J.A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses: Part I. to 1751. 4 vols (Cambridge, 1922-7), sub nomine; in a return to the court of first fruits and tenths in 1543, however, Scory is named as fourth preacher. Cf. C.R., fol. 54; cf. also D.N.B., sub nomine. For Scory's degree, cf. Grace Books [of Cambridge University], ed. by S.M. Leathes and M. Bateson, 4 vols in 5 (Cambridge, 1897-1910), Grace Book F, p. 337.

<sup>114</sup>D.N.B., sub nomine; cf. Grace Books [of Cambridge University], ed. by S.M. Leathes and M. Bateson, 4 vols in 5 (Cambridge, 1897-1910), Grace Book A, p. 527.

<sup>115</sup>Venn and Venn, op. cit., sub nomine; cf. D.N.B., sub nomine; cf. also C.R., fols 390, 395v. and 403. The Venns record that Ponet became vicar of Ashford in 1549. Cranmer's Register gives the date as 1547. Cf. C.R., fol. 403. They also give Ponet's degree in 1547 as a B.D.



	Rectories	Vicarages
Archbishop	24.9	4.9
Religious	13.2	20.8
King	6.0	0
Laity	15.0	1.6
Churchmen	2.9	10.6
Others	0.3	0

Patrons of promotions in the diocese and peculiars  
of Canterbury, 1522-35, expressed as a percentage of  
all promotions

	Rectories	Vicarages
Archbishop	19.0	10.9
Laity	18.3	12.9
King	16.7	5.1
Churchmen	6.4	10.0
Others	0.3	0.3

Patrons of promotions in the diocese and peculiars  
of Canterbury, 1541-53, expressed as a percentage of  
all promotions

	Rectories	Vicarages	Chantries	Cathedral/ Collegiate church	Others
Archbishop	19.2	8.6	1.5	3.7	0.3
Religious	2.5	4.0	1.0	0.2	0
Clergy	4.7	8.6	0.7	0	0
Laymen	14.6	9.4	2.6	0.2	0.3
Crown	12.6	3.2	0.7	1.0	0
None given	0.3	0.2	0.3	0	0

Maximum total: 594

Patrons of promotions in the diocese of Canterbury and the deaneries of immediate jurisdiction 1533-53 expressed as a percentage of all presentations

laity and the King gained advowsons at the expense of the religious following the dissolution of the monasteries.<sup>116</sup>

In conjunction with the Register of William Warham, important statistics concerning the changing patterns of patronage can be compiled from Cranmer's Register.<sup>117</sup> It is clear from the Tables that the main beneficiaries of the dissolution in terms of patronage were the King and the laity. During the period 1522-35, religious houses presented to 34% of all rectories and vicarages. The King presented to 6% of such vacancies and the laity to 16.6%. In the period 1541-53, the King's share of the patronage rose to 21.8% of all such vacancies. The laity presented to 31.2% of all vacant benefices in the same period. Professor du Boulay has shown that during the period 1533-53 Thomas Cranmer was forced to exchange temporal lands from his see with the King. In return, the archbishop was rewarded with monastic property, particularly appropriated rectories.<sup>118</sup> Throughout the periods 1522-35 and 1541-53, however, the archbishop's actual share of patronage remained constant at 30%.

---

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Zell, art. cit., pp. 526-7. Dr Zell's statistics, however, must be treated with caution since the span of years which he has used in compiling his Table is too narrow for accurate results. He has compared presentations during the years 1533-7 with those of 1541-53.

<sup>117</sup> All the statistics in the earlier Tables are compiled from W.R., II, fols 373v.-418v. and C.R., fols 339-426v. Institutions sede vacante in 1532 and 1533 are not included in the statistics.

<sup>118</sup> For the major changes in ownership of advowsons, cf. F.R.H. du Boulay, 'Archbishop Cranmer and the Canterbury Temporalities' in E.H.R., vol. LXVII(1952), pp. 19-36. Cf. F.R.H. du Boulay, The Lordship of Canterbury (London, 1966), pp. 317-29. For the government's general policy, cf. F. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 101-50.

Important local studies for the dioceses of Lincoln and Chichester have confirmed that the King and the laity were the patrons who gained most advowsons following the dissolution of the monasteries

	1521-35	1536-47
King	5.0	21.4
Laity	35.8	55.0
Churchmen	12.4	9.4
Corporations	6.1	5.0
Religious	40.6	8.8
Not given	0.1	0.1

Patrons of incumbents shown as a percentage of<sup>119</sup>  
all vacancies in benefices with cure in Lincoln  
diocese

Such results for the diocese find a parallel in the work  
of Dr Lander at Chichester.

	1506-36	1543-57
Bishop	18.8	11.4
Dean and Chapter	4.2	5.9
Individual Clerics	7.8	7.0
Secular Colleges	8.9	4.4
Religious Houses	33.9	0
Crown	0.9	22.7
Nobles	9.4	16.8
Gentry	12.8	20.2
Other Laity	3.3	11.6

Patrons of benefices with cure in Chichester diocese<sup>120</sup>  
shown as a percentage of all vacancies

<sup>119</sup> The figures are adapted from a Table in M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: the diocese of Lincoln under John Longland 1521-1547 (Cambridge, 1981), p. 123.

<sup>120</sup> The figures are likewise adapted from a Table in S.J. Lander, The Diocese of Chichester, 1508-1558: Episcopal Reform under Robert Sherburne and its Aftermath (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1974), p. 200.

At Lincoln and Chichester, it is clear that the dissolution brought an increase in powers of patronage to the King and the laity. The results from Thomas Cranmer's Register for the diocese of Canterbury confirm such a picture.

Edward VI's brief reign came to an end in July 1553.<sup>121</sup> As late as September 1553, institutions were being recorded in the archbishop's Register.<sup>122</sup> Cranmer received a writ of summons to Mary's first convocation in October.<sup>123</sup> It was on 13 November that Thomas Cranmer was deprived of his see for treason. He was condemned for that offence and the attainder was confirmed by act of parliament. Legally, the archbishopric was vacant by this attainder.<sup>124</sup> On 18 November, the dean and chapter of Canterbury wrote to Queen Mary requesting a licence to elect a new bishop 'secundum morem antiquiorem capituli ecclesie vestre metropolitice in huiusmodi casu usitatum cum omnimoda submissione'.<sup>125</sup> The licence, however, was

<sup>121</sup> Edward VI died on 6 July 1553. Cf. D.N.B., sub nomine.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. C.R., fol. 424.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., fol. 14. The writ is dated 14 August 1553.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. D.M. Loades, The Oxford Martyrs (London, 1970), pp. 119-22; cf. Stat. Realm. IV, i, pp. 217-18. Cf. also D.M. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, government, and religion in England, 1553-1558 (London, 1979), p. 101 n. 13.

<sup>125</sup> On 5 December 1553 the act, by which Edward's religious legislation was repealed, received the royal assent. Cf. Journals of the House of Commons, vol. 1-(London, 1803-), I, p. 32. The repeal act itself did not come into force until 20 December. Cf. Stat. Realm. IV, i, p. 202. This act restored the religious situation to that which had obtained in the last year of Henry VIII. The Edwardine statute, by which bishops were appointed by the simple despatch of letters missive, was swept away. Professor Loades has shown, however, that weeks before Edward's religious statutes were repealed they were a dead letter. Cf. D.M. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor:

not granted. On 16 December, Henry Harvy was appointed as auditor of causes, commissary general and official principal and keeper of the spiritualities sede vacante.<sup>126</sup> Like many episcopal Registers of the early sixteenth century, Thomas Cranmer's Register gives a most incomplete picture of his diocesan administration.<sup>127</sup> Following his appointment to the see of Canterbury in 1533, the archbishop strove to implement administrative and spiritual reforms in his registry and in the diocese. His failure to achieve greater success was a profound indication of the power of the forces ranged against him.

---

Politics, government, and religion in England, 1553-1558 (London, 1979), pp. 155-6. For the petition of the dean and chapter, cf. C.C.A.L., Register VI, fol. 49.

<sup>126</sup> C.C.A.L., Register N, fol. 1-v.; printed in Churchill, Administration, II, pp. 226-8. An undated certificate to the bishop of London, nominating Harvy and John Gibbons for the post of auditor, is recorded in C.C.A.L., Register VI, fol. 1v. This is in accord with the composition of 1278 governing the exercise of jurisdiction sede vacante. Cf. C.R., fols 36v.-7. It is interesting to note, however, that the commission specified the appointment of an official whilst the commission of 1553 conveys powers of administration sede vacante under the terms of a commission for the auditor of the audience court.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. A.G. Dickens, Robert Holgate: Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North (London, 1955), p. 21.

'The most principal minister of our spiritual jurisdiction':  
Thomas Cranmer as metropolitan of the province of Canterbury

Vos a nemine dijudicari potestis, quia ad  
Dei solius iudicium reservamini.<sup>1</sup>

In his Commonplaces from the Roman canon law, Thomas Cranmer was careful to expose the pretensions of the current church order. He rejected such claims of judicial immunity, for in the margin of the manuscript he wrote: 'Episcopi a nemine sunt iudicandi'.<sup>2</sup> It is clear that Cranmer's own understanding of his episcopal authority differed greatly from that of his predecessors.

At the coronation of Edward VI, Thomas Cranmer was careful to emphasise the parallel between the young King and his royal 'predecessor Josiah'.<sup>3</sup> In the course of the speech which Cranmer delivered at that ceremony, the prelate asserted that although it was customary for the archbishops of Canterbury to crown Kings of the realm, such prelates had no power

to receive or reject them, neither did it  
give them authority to prescribe them  
conditions to take or to leave their crowns.<sup>4</sup>

Concerning the service of coronation, the archbishop stressed that should the King not be anointed with oil, 'that king is

---

<sup>1</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 783; Continua; 'Vos reservamini' underlined in MS. The quotation in the title of this chapter is taken from a letter of 1533 from the King to the archbishop. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 238 n. 1 and 239 n.

<sup>2</sup> Strype, Cranmer, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 127.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 126.

yet a perfect monarch notwithstanding'.<sup>5</sup> Kings are anointed, not in consideration of the oil

but in consideration of their power which is ordained, of the sword which is authorised, of their persons which are elected by God, and endued with the gifts of his Spirit...<sup>6</sup>

Cranmer told the King that although he was archbishop of Canterbury, he could not 'draw up indentures between God and your majesty'.<sup>7</sup> Rather, his sole duty in the service of consecration was to

faithfully declare what God requires at the hands of kings and rulers; that is, religion and virtue.<sup>8</sup>

Clearly, Thomas Cranmer considered that his status as archbishop in no way diminished the rights of the crown.

If Thomas Cranmer preferred to look to the English crown rather than to the bishop of Rome, he saw that his titles were to be used in support of the King as supreme head. A well-known letter from the archbishop addressed to Thomas Cromwell illustrates such a concept. The letter, dated 12 May 1535, concerns two charges brought against the archbishop by Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, during Cranmer's metropolitcal visitation of that diocese. Gardiner's first point was that the archbishop's use of the style totius Anglie

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 127.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 126.



primas impugned the King's supremacy. Cranmer was quick to parry the charge. He argued that the bishop of Rome himself had had many primates under him. Yet, his supreme authority was not considered to be impugned in any way:

Why then may not the king's highness, being supreme head, have primates under him, without any diminishing, but with the augmenting, of his said supreme authority?<sup>9</sup>

Such a title was certainly not to increase Cranmer's own authority. He told Cromwell:

...I pray God never be merciful unto me at the general judgement, if...I set more by any title, name, or style that I write, than I do by the paring of an apple, farther than it shall be to the setting forth of God's word and will.<sup>10</sup>

It seems clear, however, that the archbishop sought to re-interpret the meaning of the title totius Anglie primas. No longer was it to be a sign of episcopal supremacy but rather a pledge of clerical loyalty to the crown. For Thomas Cranmer, this was consonant with the proclamation of God's holy Word.

If the archbishop sought to re-interpret his position in relation to the King, he also saw his role in a new light in relation to the clergy and laity of the province. In his speech at the coronation of King Edward VI, the archbishop refused to accept that it was the prerogative of the archbishop of Canterbury alone to preside at the service. Whilst admitting

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 304.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 305.

that it was considered proper for him to preside, he stressed that if archbishops 'cannot, or will not, any bishop may perform this ceremony'.<sup>11</sup>

It is well known that the archbishop's authority over the suffragan sees of his province stemmed from his position as metropolitan.<sup>12</sup> In his letter to Cromwell of May 1535, Cranmer expressed a pious wish:

...I would that I, and all my brethren the bishops, would leave all our styles, and write the style of our offices, calling ourselves apostolos Jesu Christi.<sup>13</sup>

In his continued use of titles in diocese and province, Cranmer sought to base them firmly upon the reforming insights of the new divinity. Looking to the Greek father Origen, the archbishop recognised the true reflection of the dominical teaching. In his sacramental Commonplace Books preserved in The British Library, Cranmer gave evidence of his ideas:

Principes quidem gentium dominantur eis et qui potestatem habent in illis magistratus vocantur.  
Non sic erit in vobis, sed qui vult vestrum fieri maior, erit omnium minimus.<sup>14</sup>

Origen uses the concept to expound his own view of Christian office within the Church, alluding to the command embodied in Luke 22<sup>25-6</sup> which concerns the true nature of authority. Thomas Cranmer was quick to penetrate to the heart of such an idea and agreed with the Greek father that 'Qui ergo vocatur

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 126.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. R.E. Rhodes, Ecclesiastical Administration in Medieval England: The Anglo-Saxons to the Reformation(Notre Dame, 1977), pp. 107-11.

<sup>13</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 305.

<sup>14</sup>B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fol. 195v.

ad episcopatum non ad principatum vocatur, sed ad servitum  
Ecclesie totius'.<sup>15</sup> Thomas Cranmer, it seems, sought to base  
his episcopal office in a Scriptural pattern of service.

The abolition of papal power in England led in  
part to an increase in the archbishop's own powers of  
jurisdiction. The court of faculties was established in  
1534 by act of parliament and it possessed an administrative  
system quite separate from the machinery of the vicar general's  
office. The establishment of such a court enabled Thomas  
Cromwell to transfer papal powers of dispensation to the  
English church. Such an action formed an important breach  
in the mediaeval patterns of ecclesiastical administration.<sup>16</sup>

The relevant parliamentary statute was passed  
in November 1533. The act laid down that no subject of the  
realm should sue to Rome for any dispensation or licence;  
anyone breaking such a law was to be liable to the penalties  
of praemunire.<sup>17</sup> All licences granted before 12 March 1534  
were to be valid.<sup>18</sup> An act of 1536, however, extended the date.<sup>19</sup>  
Stephen Gardiner's episcopal Register at Winchester reveals  
a record of a dispensation from Marseilles dated 29 October  
1533, enabling William Elmham, canon of the Augustinian

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Stat. Realm, III, pp. 464-71. The administrative machinery  
of the court is described by Dr David Chambers in his edition  
of the first two Registers of the faculty office; cf. D.S.  
Chambers, Faculty Office Registers 1534-49 (Oxford, 1966),  
pp. xx-xxxi.

<sup>17</sup> Stat. Realm, III, pp. 465 and 469-70.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 470.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., pp. 672-3.

priory of Mottisfont, to hold a secular benefice.<sup>20</sup> On 9 October at St Paul's cathedral, Richard Gwent, deputy to the papal collector Peter Vannes, granted a licence to Thomas Barton and Matilda Redmayn, of the diocese of York, to marry although related in the fourth degree of affinity.<sup>21</sup> One of the latest of such papal documents to reach England must be a dispensation issued by the Holy See dated 7 November at Marseilles. This enabled Thomas Runcorn, archdeacon of Bangor, to hold the parish church of Patrington, in the diocese of York, and the archdeaconry of Bangor with any other benefice, provided that the combined annual revenue did not amount to more than 2,000 ducats. Runcorn was also allowed to reside in Rome or at any other university, provided that he hear the offices accustomed in the Church of Rome or at Cambridge University.<sup>22</sup>

The post of commissary of the faculties was in the gift of the archbishop of Canterbury. Since the faculty office possessed administrative machinery separate from that of the vicar general's office, the commissions from the archbishop to the commissary are the only documents which should properly be recorded in the archbishop's Register. It has been suggested that no records survive concerning the first holder of the commissaryship.<sup>23</sup> Dr Chambers suggested that it

---

<sup>20</sup> Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynt, episcoporum Wintoniensium, transcribed and edited by H. Chitty (Canterbury and York Society, 37, 1930), pp. 27-8.

<sup>21</sup> L.P., VI, 1246.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., Appendix, 9.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, p. 586.

may have been one Roger Tonneshend or Townesend, who was appointed to that post by 1536.<sup>24</sup> The archbishop's Register shows that on 17 March 1535, John Cokes, Richard Gwent and Roger Townesend sat judicially in the chapel at Lambeth to confirm the election of Nicholas Shaxton as bishop of Salisbury.<sup>25</sup> Roger Townesend's office is described as commissarius ad facultates. More importantly, a copy of Townesend's commission is now known to survive. This commission is dated 10 April 1534, five days before the first dispensation was issued by the court. It was confirmed by the prior and chapter of Canterbury on 5 May 1535.<sup>26</sup> The terms of the commission are exactly the same as those embodied in the commission to Nicholas Wotton on 16 October 1538.<sup>27</sup> On 10 September 1539, Cranmer wrote to Cromwell concerning a possible vacancy in the commissaryship. Cromwell suggested William Petre for the post. In January 1536, Petre had been appointed deputy to the Vice-Gerent in all testamentary business.<sup>28</sup> His appointment as the archbishop's commissary of the faculties would have placed great powers

<sup>24</sup>Chambers, op. cit., p. xxv. Strype claimed that the first commissary was Edmund Bonner. Cf. Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 159.

<sup>25</sup>C.R., fol. 165.

<sup>26</sup>C.C.A.L., Register T2 [Register of the prior and chapter of Canterbury], fols 30v.-1 [modern foliation]; cf. ibid., fols 73v.-4. The MS. has been damaged by a fire in the Audit House in 1670, which destroyed many of the existing muniments. Cf. also Chambers, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>27</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fol. 217. Wotton's commission was not confirmed by the newly appointed dean and chapter until 8 December 1541; cf. C.C.A.L., Register U [Register of the dean and chapter], fol. 11-v. Cf. also Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 586-7 and nn. 1-2.

<sup>28</sup>B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 88Av.-90v.; L.P., I, 88.

in his hands and enabled him to receive the fees from a lucrative office. Cranmer wished the post to be given to Christopher Nevinston, his commissary general. In the event, no vacancy arose.<sup>29</sup> Wotton continued to be the commissary of the faculties during the period covered by the extant faculty office Registers during the first half of the sixteenth century. No other records have survived for the period of Thomas Cranmer's episcopate.

The commission issued to Townesend and to Wotton stressed that the commissary could issue dispensations

in quibusvis casibus a iure divino non  
prohibitis in quibus episcopus vel sedes ipsa  
Romana ante hac dispensare consuevit ac etiam  
in omnibus aliis casibus in quibus ipse  
episcopus vel sedes Romana antehac dispensare  
non consuevit dummodo tales non forent qui  
a iure divino prohibiti essent...

All such dispensations, however, were to be granted 'iuxta statuti tenorem'.<sup>30</sup> An original dispensation, previously unknown, survives among the muniments of the dean and chapter at Canterbury. On 15 February 1539, William Grene and Joan Wormeston of the parish of Stepney obtained a dispensation to marry in any parish church within times prohibited.<sup>31</sup> An original dispensation for Henry VIII to marry Catherine

<sup>29</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 394-5. In 1535, the archbishop had nominated Petre to be dean of the arches. Cf. ibid., p. 315.

<sup>30</sup> C.C.A.L., Register T2, fols 30v.-1; cf. L.P.L., C.R., fol. 217. The text of the commission is taken from Thomas Cranmer's Registers; 'antehac' corrected from 'anthac' in MS.

<sup>31</sup> C.C.A.L., Christchurch Letters, II, 273. The letters, comprising three manuscript volumes, are an artificial collection containing documents which survived a fire in the Audit House in 1670. Cf. Chambers, op. cit., p. 174.

Parr also survives.<sup>32</sup> Although parliamentary statute transferred to the archbishop the Pope's powers of dispensation, it also recognised the right of diocesan and metropolitan bishops to issue dispensations in all cases allowed by common law or custom.<sup>33</sup> The confusion caused by such stipulations is well illustrated by the archiepiscopal Register of Matthew Parker. In 1560, William Cooke, the Queen's clerk of the faculties, and William Larke, the archbishop's clerk for the same cause, asserted that Dr Yale, the archbishop's chancellor, did by the authority of the archbishop grant licences to marry in times prohibited. They maintained that such duties belonged to the office of the faculties:

...the Archebusshop...called before him at his mannor of Lambeth the said Doctor Yale his Chancellor and John Inoent his principall Register, where and when in the presence of the said Cooke and Larke, Recordes were shewed by the said Doctor Yale and John Inoent that the predecessors of the said Archebusshop, viz. Warham Cranmer and Cardinall Poole...from tyme to tyme graunted licenses to marry in the tyme prohibited.<sup>34</sup>

Cooke and Larke were unable to refute such testimony. It is clear, nevertheless, that confusion existed from the establishment of the court.

<sup>32</sup> P.R.O., E. 30. 1472(6); L.P., XVIII, i, 854. Cf. also Chambers, op. cit., pp. xxv and xxviii.

<sup>33</sup> Stat. Realm, III, p. 468.

<sup>34</sup> Registrum Matthaei Parker diocesis Cantuariensis, A.D. 1559-1575, transcribed by E.M. Thompson and edited by W.H. Frere, 3 vols (Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33), I, 360.

No preaching licences have been registered in Thomas Cranmer's episcopal Register. At Hereford, Edward Foxe's Register records that preaching licences were issued on the authority of the diocesan bishop.<sup>35</sup> The court of faculties also seems to have issued such licences. The Registers record the issue of seven such documents.<sup>36</sup>

Twelve further licences are recorded in Thomas Cranmer's Register, for which parallels are to be found in the faculty office Registers.<sup>37</sup> Nine concern dispensations for the celebration of certain sacraments in private oratories. Two deal with non-residence and one dispenses the parties to solemnize matrimony in any parish church in the province. The licences for non-residence are in favour of Robert Peterson, dean of the deanery of South Malling. On 18 February 1542, he was licensed to be absent for two years on account of ill health.<sup>38</sup> On 31 March, this was extended at pleasure, provided that his duties at the college could be fulfilled during his absence.<sup>39</sup>

Whereas Cranmer's archiepiscopal Register contains nine licences concerning the celebration of sacraments in private oratories, the faculty office Registers contain eight

<sup>35</sup> Registrum Caroli Bothe, episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MDXVI - MDXXXV, ed. by A.T. Bannister (Cantilupe Society and The Canterbury and York Society, 28, 1921), p. 372.

<sup>36</sup> Chambers, op. cit., p. xxiv n. 5.

<sup>37</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 15-v., 16-17, 18, 19, 20v., 21v.-2, 39, 40 and 47v.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., fol. 18.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., fol. 19.



similar licences. Six of the latter are valid for locations within the province of Canterbury outside the diocese<sup>40</sup> and one for the inhabitants of Pinner in the deanery of Croydon.<sup>41</sup> The remaining licence is directed to the inhabitants of Halifax.<sup>42</sup> The nine licences in the archiepiscopal Register stem from the archbishop's provincial jurisdiction.<sup>43</sup> They are autonomous, for none was confirmed by a separate licence from the faculty office.

The cumbersome nature of such parallel jurisdiction, albeit in isolated cases, is clearly revealed in two licences issued to Thomas Audley, the lord chancellor. A licence, dated 3 April 1540, made provision for baptism in the lord chancellor's residence anywhere within the province of Canterbury.<sup>44</sup> On 23 April 1540, a second licence was issued from the vicar general's office which enabled Audley to receive the Eucharist and to enjoy the sacrament of penance in a private oratory. Provision for the baptism of children was also made.<sup>45</sup> As lord chancellor, Audley was titular head of the clerk of the faculties in chancery. His own clerk did indeed have the power to confirm such grants from the faculty office valued over £4. Presumably, such confirmation was obtained by the inhabitants of Halifax, for they paid £4 for their dispensation.<sup>46</sup> Nevertheless, the lord chancellor

<sup>40</sup> Chambers, op. cit., p. xxiv and n. 6.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>43</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 15-v., 16v., 17, 20v., 39, 40 and 47v.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., fol. 40.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., fol. 39.

<sup>46</sup> Chambers, op. cit., p. 26.

duly applied to the archbishop through his vicar general for the requisite licence for his own household.

The confusion which followed the dissolution of the friaries illustrates how unpopular such parallel jurisdiction could be. On 10 March 1539, Richard Yngworth wrote to the Vice-Gerent complaining of the harsh treatment meted out to the friars by the archbishop of York, for they were not allowed to become parish priests or chantry priests without showing their letters of orders, notwithstanding their capacities,<sup>47</sup> or their letters obtained from Yngworth himself. Yngworth complained that the expense of such letters of orders was more than they could afford. Some men were forced to travel one hundred miles to seek them, and even then could not afford to pay clerks to search the relevant Register. Archbishop Lee eventually agreed that the letters from the bishop of Dover would be acceptable until their capacities arrived. Yngworth protested, however, that men were ejected from such houses by commissions other than his own.<sup>48</sup> The Dispensations Act of 1534 itself created such parallel jurisdiction between the vicar general's office and the faculty office. It is true that such overlapping jurisdiction seems to have occurred in isolated cases. Cromwell's bold action, nevertheless, in transferring papal powers of dispensation to the English church led to some confusion in the granting of licences and dispensations by the archbishop's officials.

---

<sup>47</sup>For the strict definition of a capacity, cf. Chambers, op. cit., p. xlii.

<sup>48</sup>H. Ellis, Original Letters illustrative of English History, 3rd Series, 4 vols (London, 1846), III, pp. 187-8; L.P., XIV, i, 494.

As metropolitan of the province of Canterbury, the archbishop possessed officers to aid him in his administration and the bishop of London customarily acted as dean of the province. His was the task of transmitting archiepiscopal mandates to the suffragan bishops of the province. Between 1539 and 1549, the dean of the province was Edmund Bonner. Routine administration, however, was performed by members of the London episcopal registry. During this time, ten special mandates were transmitted throughout the province. The dates of despatch are known for nine of them.<sup>49</sup>

<u>No. of</u> <u>mandates</u>	<u>Despatched on</u>	<u>1 day</u>	<u>2 days</u>	<u>3 days</u>
	<u>day of receipt</u>			
	0	4	1	2
<u>No. of</u> <u>mandates</u>	<u>4 days</u>	<u>More than 4 days</u>		
	1	1		

Table showing the interval between the receipt of archiepiscopal mandates by the bishop of London's registry and the despatch of those orders.

Such mandates related to general processions, to the royal visitation of 1547 and to changes in liturgy and ceremonial.

<sup>49</sup> Guildhall Library, London[henceforth cited as G.L.], MS. 9531/12 pt 1[part of Edmund Bonner's Register], fols 41v.-2, 46v., 60v.-1, 72v., 82v.-3, 113v., 116v., 116v.-17, and 118v.-19.

Miss Churchill has shown that the request by the crown for special prayers to be held in all parish churches of the province had a firm mediaeval precedent.<sup>50</sup> On 20 August 1543, the crown sent Bonner a mandate ordering that prayers be said within the diocese to avert poor weather.<sup>51</sup> Three days later, the dean of the province received a mandate from the archbishop ordering him to distribute the mandates to the bishops of the province. This was done two days later.<sup>52</sup> As was customary, the prayers were to be in Latin. Another mandate of similar vein was transmitted in 1542. Following a decision in council of 27 June, letters were despatched to the archbishops of Canterbury and York for processions to be held for victory against the Turks.<sup>53</sup> Three days later, the archbishop despatched a mandate to the bishop of London for the transmittal of such orders throughout the province.<sup>54</sup> The Turkish wars also prompted the government to demand special contributions from each parish. The archbishop transmitted the order to the bishop of London for dispersal throughout the province.<sup>55</sup> A model sermon was included;

<sup>50</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 358-9 and p. 359 n. 2.

<sup>51</sup> G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fol. 46. On the same day, mandates were despatched to his diocesan officials.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., fol. 46v. Cf. G.R., fol. 22-v.; of. also The Registers of Thomas Wolsey, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1518-1523, John Clerke, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1523-1541, William Knyght, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1541-1547, and Gilbert Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1554-1559, ed. by H. Maxwell-Lyte (Somerset Record Society, 55, 1940) [henceforth cited as Clerke and Knyght], no. 561; of. also U.L.C., E.D.R., G/1/7, fols 155v.-6.

<sup>53</sup> A.P.C., I, p. 15.

<sup>54</sup> Clerke and Knyght, no. 530. Cf. U.L.C., E.D.R., G/1/7, fols 148-v.; of. G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fols 41v.-2.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fol. 45v.; of. ibid., fol. 47-v.

its authorship is unknown.<sup>56</sup>

From 1544, Bonner was responsible for transmitting mandates authorizing the use of the Litany in English. The publication of the Litany marked an important stage in the archbishop's theological designs. Although it is unclear if Cranmer actually instigated the measure, his desire for Holy Scripture to be read in the vernacular is well known. When Thomas Cromwell procured the use of Thomas Matthew's translation of the Bible throughout the realm, Cranmer told the King's minister that he had given him 'more pleasure herein, than if you had given me a thousand pound'.<sup>57</sup> In October 1544, the archbishop wrote to the King concerning a projected reform of the Processionale. He confessed that he had been constrained to use more than the liberty of a translator.<sup>58</sup> In the legal Commonplace Book, Cranmer agreed with the Decretum of Gratian which stressed:

Numquid verborum multitudine flecti Deus ut homo potest? Non enim verbis tantum, sed corde orandus est Deus.<sup>59</sup>

In his letter to the King, the archbishop explained:

...in some processions I have altered divers words; in some I have added part; in some taken

Thomas Thirlby's Register for the diocese of Westminster also records the archbishop's mandate; cf. ibid., fols 255-6. The see of Westminster possessed diocesan status between the years 1540 and 1550. It then became part of the diocese of London, the episcopal muniments becoming part of the possessions of the see of London. Cf. Smith, Registers, p. 202. The archbishop's letter requesting contributions is unpublished.

<sup>56</sup> G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fols 45v.-6.

<sup>57</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 345-6.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 412. Cf. F.E. Brightman, 'The Litany under Henry VIII' in E.H.R., vol. XXIV (1909), pp. 101-4.

<sup>59</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, p. 818; Non mediocriter; 'Numquid ...Deus' underlined in MS.

part away; some I have left out whole...and  
some processions I have added whole...<sup>60</sup>

In propounding spiritual reforms, Cranmer was concerned to instil a devotion which sprang from 'cordis puritate et serenitate ac spirituali hilaritate'.<sup>61</sup> In his letter to the King, the archbishop expressed the hope that the reform of the Processionale would 'stir the hearts of all men unto devotion and godliness'.<sup>62</sup> Such aspirations surely embrace his translation of the English Litany. On 11 June, the crown issued letters to the archbishop for prayers to be held due to wars in Christendom. The King stated that he had authorized godly prayers in the English tongue, which were to be used in processions for peace. The order was enforced throughout the province with some efficiency. On 19 June, the London episcopal registry issued mandates to the bishops of the province and to diocesan officials: 'Memorandum quod emanavit similis executio singulis episcopis provincie Cant' sub dato et sigillo predictis pro debita publicatione litterarum preinsertarum'.<sup>63</sup>

During Bonner's episcopacy, his diocesan registry was called upon to transmit three further mandates for the use of the English Litany. As the country waged war in France, Scotland and Boulogne letters missive were despatched

<sup>60</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, loc. cit.

<sup>61</sup> Strype, loc. cit.: 'cordis...hilaritate' underlined in MS.

<sup>62</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, loc. cit.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fols 60v.-1. Cf. also L.P.L., C.R., fols 48v.-50; U.L.C., E.D.R., G/1/7, fols 164-5v.; Clarke and Knight, no. 583.

to the archbishop on 10 August 1545 announcing the launch of a powerful navy and commanding prayers for peace.<sup>64</sup>

On 15 October 1545, the archbishop commanded Bonner on the King's authority that for the sake of uniformity the English Litany was to be used not only on accustomed weekdays, but also from henceforth on Sundays and festivals.<sup>65</sup> On 18 October, being a Sunday and St Luke's day, the choir of St Paul's cathedral sang the procession in English according to the King's injunction.<sup>66</sup> From henceforth, the English Litany was to be regarded as the sole procession, and the Processionale was abolished.

Following the death of Henry VIII, evidence survives for the use of the English Litany under Somerset's protectorship. The royal injunctions of 1547 insisted that due to strife which had arisen 'by reason of fond courtesy and challenging of places in procession', the only occasion on which processions might be used from henceforth was to be before Mass when

the priests with other of the choir shall kneel in the midst of the church, and sing or say plainly and distinctly the Litany which is set forth in English with all the suffrages

<sup>64</sup> C.R., fols 26v.-7; cf. Clerke and Knyght, no. 609. Cf. also G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt i, fol. 72-v.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt i, fols 82v.-3; cf. also Clerke and Knyght, no. 615 and U.L.C., E.D.R., G/1/7, fol. 176-v. This is the injunction for which Brightman could find no manuscript evidence. Cf. Brightman, art. cit., p. 103.

<sup>66</sup> C. Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England during the reigns of the Tudors from 1485 to 1559, ed. in 2 vols for The Camden Society by W.D. Hamilton (London, 1875-7), I, p. 161.

following, and none other procession or Litany to be had or used but the said Litany in English...

In September 1547, the English defeated the Scots at the Battle of Pinkey.<sup>68</sup> In that month, the council decreed that processions in English and the Te Deum were to be held in St Paul's with a sermon in the presence of the mayor, aldermen and citizens. All bishops were to do likewise in their cathedrals and parish churches. The archbishop transmitted the order to the dean and chapter of London on 18 September.<sup>69</sup> Wriothesley reported that on St Matthew's eve, 20 September, the bishop of Lincoln preached a sermon with processions and the Te Deum. The clergy and choir sang the Litany kneeling in the choir. On the following day, all the parish churches in London did likewise.<sup>70</sup>

Dr Alexander has shown that for the first two and a half years of Edward's reign, Bonner was able to accommodate himself to the government's religious policies.<sup>71</sup> In August

---

<sup>67</sup>Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations, I, p. 399. The types of procession thus displaced are described in F.E. Brightman, The English Rite, 2nd rev. ed., 2 vols (Farnborough, 1970), pp. lxiii-lxiv.

<sup>68</sup>Cf. M.L. Bush, The Government Policy of Protector Somerset (London, 1975), p. 12.

<sup>69</sup>C.R., fol. 55-v.; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 66. The date of the letter in Cranmer's Register is 18 December, but this seems to be a mistake. Dr Alexander has shown that between 12 and 27 September 1547, Bonner was imprisoned in the Fleet for opposing the royal visitation. Cf. G.M.V. Alexander, The Life and Career of Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, until his deprivation in 1549 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of London, 1960), pp. 436-8. Since Cranmer's letter was duly sent to the dean and chapter, rather than to Bonner as dean of the province, this seems to show that the date of the archbishop's letter should be 18 September, 1547.

<sup>70</sup>Wriothesley, op. cit., I, p. 186.

<sup>71</sup>Alexander, op. cit., pp. 436-9.



1547, however, he fell into trouble with the council concerning his attitude to the royal visitation. On 4 May 1547, the crown despatched an inhibition to the archbishop concerning such a visitation. The archbishop transmitted it to the bishop of London on 15 May.<sup>72</sup> A relaxation of the inhibition, lest the King's subjects suffer injury or incur expense through the suspension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, was sent to the archbishop on 6 May, who transmitted it to the bishop of London on 3 June.<sup>73</sup> The royal visitors issued their citation to the bishop on 20 August to appear before them in the chapter house on 5 September.<sup>74</sup> In July, injunctions had been issued by the crown ordering the destruction of all superstitious images and the setting up of the Paraphrases of Erasmus and the Homilies.<sup>75</sup> Bonner protested against them:

I do receive thies Injunctions and Homelies with this protestacion; that I will observe them if they be not contrary and repugnant to Goddes Lawe and the Statutes and Ordinances of this Church.<sup>76</sup>

The royal visitors complained to the privy council. The Homilies contained unequivocal statements regarding the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Bonner also

<sup>72</sup> C.R., fol. 31-v.; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 40.

<sup>73</sup> C.R., fols 31v.-2; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 41.

<sup>74</sup> G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt 1, fol. 115-v.

<sup>75</sup> Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations, I, pp. 393-403.

<sup>76</sup> A.P.C., II, p. 126.

questioned the authority of the crown.<sup>77</sup> Despite his resistance to the visitation, the inhibition had been duly transmitted by Bonner's episcopal registry to the bishops of the province. On 16 May, it was despatched to the bishop of Ely.<sup>78</sup> On 12 September, the bishop was convented before the council. Faced with their accusations of contempt for the King's authority, Bonner relented:

...uppon better consideracion of my dewty of obedience, and of the yll exemple that may ensewe...I do nowe...revoc my sayd protestacion...<sup>79</sup>

Dr Alexander has shown that Bonner was imprisoned in the Fleet from 12 to 27 September.<sup>80</sup> He was released on bail for a few weeks and by 23 October he was entirely free. Throughout 1548 and the early months of 1549, Bonner maintained outward conformity. He performed his role as dean of the province in transmitting orders for the abolition of all images<sup>81</sup> and ashes and palms.<sup>82</sup> Early in 1549, he voted against the Act of Uniformity in the Lords. He was dilatory in enforcing the use of The Book of Common Prayer in the diocese.<sup>83</sup> In his resistance, however, Bonner did not use his position as dean of the province to frustrate the government's policies. The final test came in September 1549. He was

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., p. 125.

<sup>78</sup> G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt i, fol. 113v.

<sup>79</sup> A.P.C., II, pp. 126-7.

<sup>80</sup> Alexander, op. cit., pp. 436-8.

<sup>81</sup> G.L., MS. 9531/12 pt i, fols 116-v.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., fols 116v.-17.

<sup>83</sup> Alexander, op. cit., pp. 438-9.

ordered to preach a trial sermon to demonstrate his conformity. In that sermon, he asserted the doctrine of transubstantiation and did not affirm that the King possessed full authority although a minor. He was deprived of his see in October 1549.<sup>84</sup>

It was the Act in restraint of annates of 1534 which abolished the practice of appointing bishops to English sees by means of papal provision.<sup>85</sup> The statute of 1534 laid down that from henceforth, no person was to be presented to the Pope. Rather, the King was to grant to the cathedral chapter licence to elect a new bishop with letters missive informing them of the person they were to elect. The archbishop of the province was to confirm the election and to consecrate the bishop elect. Even under the system of papal provision, however, cathedral chapters had continued to meet formally to elect their bishops. Chapters appointed and Popes provided the royal nominee. The process is well illustrated in the appointment of William Waynflete to the see of Winchester in 1447. The licence for the election to be held was sought on 12 April. On 11 April, the King sent a letter to the prior of Winchester 'For to chowse William Waynflete as bishop'. Custody of the temporalities was granted on the same day. The licence to elect was granted on 15 April. Two days later, Waynflete's formal election

---

<sup>84</sup>Alexander, op. cit., pp. 440-55.

<sup>85</sup>Stat. Realm, III, pp. 462-4.

was notified to the King and the Pope. The latter issued the papal bull of provision on 10 May. Plenary restitution of the temporalities followed on 4 June. Waynflete made his profession to the see of Canterbury on 16 June. He was consecrated on 30 June at Eton College.<sup>86</sup>

Following the passage of the statute of 1534, sixty episcopal appointments fell beneath the archbishop's purview.<sup>87</sup> Two were to archiepiscopal sees, twenty nine to diocesan sees of the old foundation, five to sees of the new foundation, eleven to new suffragan sees, and thirteen to sees following changes in the method of episcopal appointments under Edward VI. Under Henry VIII, the acta for appointments to diocesan sees of the old foundation fall into three distinct categories. The first phase was concerned with capitular election of the royal nominee. It then fell to the archbishop to confirm the election. The final stage consisted in the consecration of the bishop confirmatus.

The most important document produced in the first stage of the election was the processus electionis which recorded the course of the election by the diocesan chapter. In two cases, however, the document has been replaced by simple petitions. Amongst the acta confirmationis of the election of Holgate to Llandaff, a simple request was made

<sup>86</sup> B. Jones, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, IV: Monastic Cathedrals (Southern Province) (London, 1963), p. 46.

<sup>87</sup> C.R., fols 80-7v., 149-215, 217v.-336. Records relating to the appointments of Hilsey to Rochester and Latimer to Worcester in 1535 have not been recorded. Cf. L.P., IX, 236(5, 12, 13) and 729(7, 8).

to the archbishop for confirmation of the election.<sup>88</sup>

When Heath was appointed to Rochester, a simple petition was sent to the crown requesting royal assent for the

election.<sup>89</sup> The record of Bell's appointment to Worcester

is incomplete.<sup>90</sup> In its fullest form, the processus electionis

embodied a number of distinctive features. When Goodrich

was appointed to Ely in 1534, the process was unusually

elaborate. Stating that the see was vacant through the

death of Nicholas West, the prior reported that the chapter

had requested and received licence to elect from the crown.

On 17 March, the convent assembled in the chapter house and the

members are noted by name as being present. The constitution

Quia propter was read and it was decided that the election

should take place per viam compromissi. Three compromissarii

unanimously chose Goodrich as their bishop. A schedule of

election was drawn up. Singing the Te Deum, the assembly

proceeded to the high altar in the cathedral where there was

a sermon in English and the result of the election was

announced to the ringing of the priory bells. On 20 March,

two proctors met Goodrich at Westminster and obtained his

assent to the election. The process ends with a request for

the archbishop to confirm the election.<sup>91</sup> Such processes

---

<sup>88</sup> C.R., fol. 199v.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., fols 258v.-9.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., fols 224v.-5.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., fols 82v.-5v.

might be addressed either to the crown<sup>92</sup> or to the archbishop.<sup>93</sup>

The process of confirmation produced judicial acta of some complexity. When Goodrich was appointed to Ely in 1534, the court which met to confirm the election sat in Croydon parish church on 13 April. Opposers to the election were cited coram domino, ad ostium cancelli and ad valvas. The archbishop then read the first schedule against opposers, by which all opposers who had not appeared were pronounced contumacious. The summary petition, outlining the acta in the election, was read. Royal letters patent addressed to the archbishop and requesting confirmation and consecration were produced. A number of documents were presented in support of the summary petition. These consisted of the process of election, the assent of the elect and the depositions of witnesses. The archbishop read a second schedule against opposers. He then pronounced the definitive sentence, confirming Goodrich's election.<sup>94</sup>

The summary petition consisted of a number of articles which gave a summary of the progress in the election. When Roland Lee was appointed to the see of Coventry and Lichfield, the summary petition consisted of ten such articles. The first article asserted that the cathedral churches of Coventry and Lichfield were vacant. The next four articles described the proceedings concerning the receipt of

<sup>92</sup> Cf., for example, ibid., fols 185, 258v.-9, and 280

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., fols 82v., 151 and 160.

<sup>94</sup> C.R., fols 81-7v. A similar process, lacking the Henrician claims to supremacy within the English church, is to be found in early Canterbury Registers. Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 244-54.

the licence to elect and Lee's election in chapter. The next three articles show that the consent of the elect was duly obtained in writing. The ninth article asserted that the King had given his assent to the election. The final article requested the archbishop to confirm Lee's appointment.<sup>95</sup>

The remaining appointments during Cranmer's archiepiscopate were made using administrative machinery far less complex. An act for the creation of new suffragan sees was passed by parliament in 1534.<sup>96</sup> Twenty six suffragan sees were established according to the terms of the statute. Within the province of Canterbury, eleven such bishops were eventually appointed.<sup>97</sup> The method of appointment was carefully laid down by statute. Diocesans were to nominate to the King two men. Following the selection of one by the crown, notification of the choice was despatched to the archbishop's registry. The receipt of such a document initiated the archbishop's role in such acts, for it embodied a request for consecration. Following consecration, letters testimonial were issued from Lambeth. Similarly, the process of appointing bishops to the newly established diocesan sees following the dissolution was much simplified. Four such

---

<sup>95</sup> C.R., fols 150-1.

<sup>96</sup> Stat. Realm, III, pp. 509-10.

<sup>97</sup> C.R., fols 187-8v., 197v.-8, 201-4v., 214-15, 223-4.

sets of records survive in the archbishop's Register.<sup>98</sup> As the founder of the sees, the crown was patron of the bishoprics. Consequently, the archbishop's role was simply that of consecration. Royal letters patent were despatched informing the archbishop of the King's nomination and requesting consecration.

The statute of 1534 laid down strict directions for the archbishop in the performance of his duties. He was to confirm the election of, or consecrate, the bishop elect within twenty days of receiving the royal assent. Concerning the appointment of suffragan bishops, consecration was to take place within three months of the receipt of the letters patent. The table overleaf shows that the archbishop duly acted in accord with the demands of the law.

The archbishop's role in the appointment of diocesan bishops within the province of Canterbury was severely curtailed by statute in 1547, which laid down

<sup>98</sup> Stat. Realm. III, 728. C.R., fols 260v.-1, 269v.-70v., 271-v. and 284v.-5v. One record is missing from the series. In 1542, the monastery of Oseney was erected into the cathedral church of Oxford. The first bishop was Robert King, suffragan bishop of Rheon in partibus. Cf. L.P., XVII, 881(3, 9, 25-6). No record of the bishop's appointment appears in the Register. Cf. H.B.C., p. 269.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. L.P., X, 597(7); ibid., 597(5); XI, 519(19); XII pt ii, 191(19); 191(14); 1008(34); 1311(13); 1311(5); XIII pt i, 646(65); 646(2) [where the date is given as 2 March, whereas the episcopal Register of Thomas Cranmer gives the date as 22 March; cf. C.R., fol. 214v.; XIV pt i, 403(55)].

<sup>100</sup> H.B.C., pp. 271-2 and C.R., fol. 215. Maxwell-Lyte has shown that from 1439, the date of Letters Patent was to be that of their issue. Cf. Sir H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, Historical Notes on the use of the Great Seal of England (London, 1926), p. 258.



<u>Bishop</u>	<u>Date of Letters Patent</u> <sup>99</sup>	<u>Consecration</u> <sup>100</sup>	<u>Interval(days)</u>
Thomas Manning(Ipswich)	7 March, 1536	19 March, 1536	12
John Salisbury(Thetford)	6 March, 1536	19 March, 1536	13
William Moor(Colchester)	26 September, 1536	20 October, 1536	24
John Bird(Penreth)	15 June, 1537	24 June, 1537	9
Lewis Thomas(Shrewsbury)	13 June, 1537	24 June, 1537	11
Thomas Morley(Marlborough)	23 October, 1537	4 November, 1537	12
Richard Yngworth(Dover)	8 December, 1537	9 December, 1537	1
John Hodgkin(Bedford)	3 December, 1537	9 December, 1537	6
William Finch(Taunton)	25 March, 1538	7 April, 1538	13
Henry Holbeach(Bristol)	22 March, 1538	24 March, 1538	2
John Bradley(Shaftesbury)	19 February, 1539	23 March, 1539	32

Table showing the dates of the issue of the letters patent for, and the dates of the consecration of, suffragan bishops in Thomas Cranmer's Register 1533-53.

that

...wheras the saide elections be in verie dede  
no elections but onlie by a writt of Conge  
dislier have colo<sup>rs</sup> shadowes or pretences of  
elections, s<sup>r</sup>vinge nevertheles to no purpose  
and seminge allso derogatorie and prejudicyall  
to the Kinges prerogative Royall...<sup>101</sup>

appointment of bishops was to be made by the simple issue of  
royal letters patent, naming the crown's nominee. The  
archbishop's task was that of consecration and the despatch  
of the mandate for enthronement to the archdeacon of  
Canterbury. Seven such consecrations were performed under  
the terms of the act.<sup>102</sup> No stipulations concerning the  
time of consecration were made. The first bishop to be so  
appointed was Robert Ferrar to St David's. The Register  
heading runs: 'Consecratio domini Roberti Farrar, episcopi  
Menevensis. primi consecrati ad...regie maiestatis nominationem  
post statutum editum primo anno regni Regis Edwardi sexti etc.'.<sup>103</sup>

The archbishop himself presided at all such  
consecrations. The main reason for this seems to be that  
from 1550, the new Ordinal was used. Ponet, appointed to  
the see of Rochester in 1550, was the first bishop to be so  
consecrated.<sup>104</sup> Six appointments by way of translation  
between diocesan sees were made under the terms of the  
statute.<sup>105</sup> It is unclear how the archbishop's role in such

<sup>101</sup> Stat. Realm. IV, 1, pp. 3-4.

<sup>102</sup> H.B.C., pp. 202-80.

<sup>103</sup> C.R., fol. 327v.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., fols 330v.-2.

<sup>105</sup> H.B.C., loc. cit.

cases was initiated since no relevant documents are entered on the patent rolls. His sole duty appears to have been to despatch a mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury for enthronement. Two have survived in the Register for Thomas Thirlby's translation to Norwich and Nicholas Ridley's translation to London.<sup>106</sup>

It has already been shown that from 1534, all newly appointed bishops were to swear an oath to the crown.<sup>107</sup> After the adoption of the Ordinal of 1550, the registry at Lambeth recorded the oath of allegiance which was to be taken to the archbishop at the service of consecration. The terms of the oath were:

I, N., chosen Bishop of the church and see of N. do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Archbishop and to the Metropolitan church of N. and to their successors, so help me God and his holy Gospel.<sup>108</sup>

With all reference to the see of Rome removed, such an oath was similar to the mediaeval profession.<sup>109</sup>

Records of the fees payable to the archbishop are also preserved. Information concerning the income from spiritualia is otherwise extremely sparse for Cranmer's episcopate. Under the terms of the statute of 1534 for the

<sup>106</sup> C.P.R. Edward VI. III, pp. 171-2; cf. C.R., fols 329v. and 330-v.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. supra, pp. 82-5.

<sup>108</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 182.

<sup>109</sup> Churchill, Administration, II, p. 132.

appointment of diocesan bishops, the archbishop was to receive £10, the chancellor £5, the principal registrar £5, the registrar of the certificate 13s 4d, the apparitor general 10s; for the diet of the archbishop and assistant bishops on the day of consecration, the fee was £10. For consecration, the chancellor and principal registrar were each to receive 40s and the general apparitor 20s. For installation, the archdeacon of Canterbury was to be given £6 13s 4d.<sup>110</sup> The statute of 1547 complained of excessive charges and new fees were to be offered to the archbishop. The archbishop was to receive £10, the official principal £5 and £10 for expenses; the principal registrar received £7 and the archdeacon £5. Under both scales of fees, non-monetary perquisites were also mentioned. Yet, the total fees payable were reduced from £44 to £37. The Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1535 shows that while the archbishop's net taxable income from temporalities was £3006, that from spiritualities was £228.<sup>111</sup> Such a figure for spiritual income is too low. Dr Felicity Heal has shown that since the compilers of the Valor were laymen, they did not fully understand spiritual casualties and tended to underestimate their value. The figures of that document, moreover,

---

<sup>110</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 80.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. ibid., fol. 327v. Cooke's expenses appear as £10, £7 in MS.; Valor Ecclesiasticus [henceforth cited as V.E.], I, pp. 1-7. For a general account of the revenues of the bishops under Henry VIII, cf. F. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 50-64.

record anticipated receipts before the deduction of all costs. Dr Heal has shown, however, that all such figures in the Valor indicate that the bishops received the bulk of the income of their ecclesiastical office from the temporalities, rather than the spiritualities, of the see.

The archbishop's role in the appointment of bishops to vacant sees was carefully regulated by statute in the years after 1534. In that year, the imperial ambassador Eustace Chapuys told his master, Charles V, that Cranmer had given proof of his opposition to the Pope in making the bulls for, and consecrating, three bishops on his own authority. He contrasted such actions with the King's own authority over the English church.<sup>112</sup> Cranmer's position, however, was not papal. Following the statute of 1534 regulating the appointment of bishops to diocesan sees, the central document in the process of episcopal appointments was the despatch to the cathedral chapter of the letters missive containing the name of the King's nominee to the vacant bishopric. Significantly, such a document is nowhere recorded in the archbishop's Register. When the archbishop issued the definitive sentence confirming the capitular election, he did not claim to bestow jurisdiction upon the bishop. In the oath which Lee offered to the crown as bishop of Coventry and Lichfield elect, he acknowledged that he held the bishopric 'wholly and only of your gift: and to

---

<sup>112</sup> L.P., VII, 530.

have and to hold the profits temporal and spiritual of the same only of your majesty'.<sup>113</sup> He acknowledged the King to be supreme head of the English church and renounced the authority of the bishop of Rome. After 1535, such claims were given further expression in the commissions entrusted to each bishop for the exercise of his jurisdiction.<sup>114</sup> In that commission, the King bestowed powers of jurisdiction upon the new bishop. He did not claim to bestow power of orders, simply those things 'preter et ultra ea que tibi ex sacris litteris divinitus commissa dinoscuntur'.<sup>115</sup> It was the archbishop's role, therefore, to consecrate the new bishop.

The Dispensations Act of 1534 placed important new powers in the hands of the archbishop. Since such faculty jurisdiction was not exercised through the vicar general's office, it has left little trace in the archbishop's Register. Nevertheless, there does seem to have been a confusing overlap in the administrative practices of both offices. As dean of the province, the bishop of London was called upon to transmit mandates to the bishops of the province. During his tenure of the see of London, Edmund Bonner did not use his position as dean to offer resistance to the government's religious reforms. The archbishop himself formulated new ideas concerning his concept of archiepiscopal authority. His role in the appointment of bishops, however, reveals

---

<sup>113</sup> Burnet, Hist. Ref., IV, 291.

<sup>114</sup> For Cranmer's commission of 1535, cf. B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fol. 98-v.

<sup>115</sup> C.R., fol. 28v.-9; cf. Appendix, Letters and Commissions, 37.

his position in relation to the crown at its starkest. Nevertheless, that prelate believed that the Prince held a Scriptural right to rule the English church. Concerning the possession of the spiritual and temporal swords, he maintained that 'the king hath both'.<sup>116</sup>

<sup>116</sup>P.S., Granmer II, p. 213.

Power and Protest: the exercise of metropolitical jurisdiction  
in Thomas Cranmer's Register

...if my said lord of Winchester's objections should be allowed this year, he might by such arguments both disallow all manner visitations that hath be done these ten years past, and that ever shall be done hereafter.<sup>1</sup>

In May 1535, Thomas Cranmer dispatched a stinging reply to Thomas Cromwell, the King's Vice-Gerent, concerning the bishop of Winchester's plea that his diocese should be exempt from the archbishop's metropolitical visitation. That visitation proved crucial to the relationship between the archbishop and the King. It was due to the opposition of certain bishops to the exercise of such jurisdiction by the archbishop that the Vice-Gerency was born.

Thomas Cranmer's Register is not primarily a court book.<sup>2</sup> The Register records the archbishop's administrative, not his legal, work. The sole documents preserved in the Register from the metropolitical visitation of Thomas Cranmer concern the bishops' protests against the exercise of such authority. The archbishop was consecrated on 30 March 1533.<sup>3</sup> Before he might visit the province, he had first to visit his diocese. On 21 November, there was despatched from Otford a citation and inhibition to the monks of

---

<sup>1</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 306.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Registrum Matthei Parker diocesis Cantuariensis, A.D. 1559-1575, transcribed and edited by E.M. Thompson and W.H. Frere, 3 vols (Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33), I, p. xiii.

<sup>3</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 4-5v.



Canterbury cathedral to assemble in the chapter house to undergo his visitation on 9 December.<sup>4</sup> Nothing survives concerning the visitation. A commission, dated 4 December, was issued to Richard Gwent to visit the religious houses of St Gregory, St Sepulchre and St James Canterbury, Faversham and the college of Wingham. He was also to visit the rural deaneries of Canterbury, Westbere and Sandwich.<sup>5</sup> Eight further certificates of execution or copies of the inhibition survive for the bishop of Lincoln, the abbot of Tewkesbury, the abbey of Faversham, the prior of Stixwold, the abbot of Colchester, Merton College Oxford, the abbot of Peterborough and the abbot of Winchcombe.<sup>6</sup>

Dr Margaret Bowker has shown that John Longland, bishop of Lincoln, used the archbishop's visitation to help forge a new relationship between Church and State.<sup>7</sup> New evidence preserved in The Public Record Office, however, now shows how deeply the bishop felt that Cranmer's metropolitanical jurisdiction acted in derogation of the King's supremacy. The inhibition Suscepti regiminis gregis was received by the

<sup>4</sup>C.C.A.L., Register T2, fol. 22v.

<sup>5</sup>L.P.L., Cartae Miscellaneae [henceforth cited as C.M.], XII, 56. For a guide to the contents of this class of manuscripts at Lambeth Palace, cf. D.M. Owen, A Catalogue of Lambeth Palace Manuscripts 889 to 901 (Cartae Antiquae et Miscellaneae) (London, 1968).

<sup>6</sup>Cf. C.M., II, 1, 49, 55, 63, 65, 78; VI, 71; XI, 56 respectively. A proxy for appearance at the visitation also survives. Thomas Newman, rector of Stifford and vicar of Wo—(London diocese) appointed Henry Bowsell, notary public, and Thomas Shingleton, notary public, to act for him. The proxy is dated 26 June 1534 and endorsed 'Exhib' in vis' metropolitica. Potkyn'. Cf. C.M., XIII, 28.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. M. Bowker, 'The Supremacy and the Episcopate: The Struggle for Control, 1534-1540' in The Historical Journal, vol. XVIII, 2 (1975), pp. 227-43. Cf. also M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: The diocese of Lincoln under John Longland 1521-47 (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 72-8.

bishop of Lincoln on 11 June.<sup>8</sup> The archbishop's inhibition stressed that he intended 'totam nostram provinciam Cantuariensem iure metropolitico actualiter visitare'. The prelate was styled archbishop of Canterbury, primate of all England and metropolitan. Longland did not dispatch a certificate of execution to the archiepiscopal registry, however, until 29 July.<sup>9</sup> Some six days after he had received the inhibition, the bishop issued an appeal against Cranmer's jurisdiction. For seventy years and more, the memory of man running not to the contrary, the bishops and clergy of the diocese of Lincoln had been 'liberi et immunes ac auctoritate sufficienti exempti sive exonerati ab omni et omnimoda visitatione metropolitana'.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, he insisted that the clergy of the diocese were not bound to pay procurations. The archbishop, nonetheless, intended to exercise powers of jurisdiction in the diocese. He had cited him, Longland, to appear before him and had inhibited his jurisdiction. To preserve his status and the status of the rest of the clergy in his diocese, he appealed

Ad excellentissimum in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum Henricum octavum [etc.] nostrum in hac parte, iuxta acta parlamenti sui nuperime celebrati, iudicem supremum in cancellaria sua...<sup>11</sup>

On 29 July, Longland issued another protest. He swore that

<sup>8</sup> P.R.O., SP 1/91, fols 8-9; L.P., VIII, 312; cf. L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II, fols 1-4 [first numeration].

<sup>9</sup> L.P.L., C.M., II, 1.

<sup>10</sup> P.R.O., SP 1/91, fols 8-9.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

neither he nor the clergy of his diocese would act in derogation of the King's authority:

non intendimus quioquam agere...in  
derogationem excellentissimi in Christo  
principis et domini nostri domini Henrici  
octavi[etc.] regalie aut corone sue regie.  
statutorum vel consuetudinum huius regni Anglie...<sup>12</sup>

The motives behind Longland's protests were twofold. In 1531, the convocation of Canterbury had granted to the King a payment of £100, 000 when faced with a praemunire indictment for having acknowledged Wolsey's legatine authority. The wording of the act of pardon, however, excused the clergy for the mere fact of having exercised spiritual jurisdiction.<sup>13</sup> In his appeal to history, Longland emphasised the fact that bishops of Lincoln had not recognized the archbishop's powers of metropolitical visitation for over seventy years. In part, therefore, Longland's protest was defensive. Nonetheless, Longland had obeyed the archbishop's inhibition. On 15 June, he sent a citation to the dean and chapter of Lincoln to appear before the archbishop of Canterbury in the chapter house on 5 August.<sup>14</sup> Longland was not able to accept that Cranmer possessed metropolitical jurisdiction without

<sup>12</sup>P.R.O., SP 1/85, fol. 101-v.; L.P., VII, 1044.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. S.E. Lehmborg, The Reformation Parliament 1529-1536 (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 107-16, 119, and 126-8. Cf. also Stat. Realm. III, pp. 334-8. Dr Kelly has called the government's action a 'betrayal'. Cf. M.J. Kelly, Canterbury Jurisdiction and Influence during the episcopate of William Warham, 1503-32 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1963), p. 227.

<sup>14</sup>L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II, fols 1-4 [first numeration]. Two original letters of proxy survive at Lambeth. Cf. G.M., II, 56; VI, 53.

admitting that such authority stemmed from the archbishop's papal bulls of provision.<sup>15</sup> In his appeal to the King in chancery, therefore, Longland invited the government to clarify the relationship between Church and State.<sup>16</sup>

Despite Longland's protests, the visitation went ahead. On Tuesday, 4 August 1534, Richard Gwent the archbishop's commissary visited the bishop and the cathedral chapter in the chapter house at Lincoln. Richard Hoore preached a sermon. John Rayne, the bishop's proctor, repeated Longland's protest of 29 July and the dean made a protest on behalf of the chapter. Gwent pronounced all those absent contumacious and reserved the punishment until 1 December. He then pronounced that he would examine Rayne and the dean and chapter. A liber examinationis was drawn up, but this has not survived.<sup>17</sup> On 7 August, Gwent appeared in the chapter house and prorogued the visitation until 1 December. The dean and chapter paid 66s in procurations. Rayne refused to pay, saying that the predecessors of the bishop of Lincoln were not accustomed to such demands for procurations. Gwent said that procurations were indeed due 'ratione dictae visitationis metropolitice tam de iure quam de privilegio. prerogativa et prescripta consuetudine ecclesie metropolitice Christi Cant'.<sup>18</sup> Nothing further

<sup>15</sup> L.P.L., G.R., fols 1-5v.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Bowker, op. cit., p. 73. Cf. also Bowker, art. cit., pp. 231-4.

<sup>17</sup> P.R.O., SP 1/85, fols 102v.-3.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., fols 103-v. Gwent's deed of prorogation is recorded in ibid., fols 103v.-4. The protestation of the bishop and cathedral chapter occurs in ibid., fols 104-5.

survives concerning Gwent's actions. It is clear, nonetheless, that the protests continued until March 1535. On 27 March Thomas Swillington, suffragan bishop of Philadelphia, held an ordination in the chapel of St Mary Magdalene in Lincoln cathedral on the authority of the bishop of Lincoln.<sup>19</sup> On 31 August 1534, John Pryn appeared as proxy for the bishop in Gainsborough parish church. Hugh Coren, the archbishop's commissary, had admitted John Gyldon to the vicarage of Ewerby and another clerk 'cuius nomen ignoro' to Etton parish church. Longland protested that the power of admission to benefices belonged to him as diocesan.<sup>20</sup> In a copy of the protestation despatched to the King in chancery, Longland included a copy of certain acts which he had performed pendente visitatione.<sup>21</sup> These consisted of letters dimissory for John Pollard and William Thorpe for ordination outside the diocese. In addition, two wills were proved. The testament of Thomas Fisher was proved before the bishop on 14 January 1535. That of Gilbert Wigan was proved by the commissary general on 2 March.

Longland's protest was certainly not prompted by resistance to the King's supremacy. The archbishop's commissaries were armed with a royal mandate which did not allow the bishops to offer resistance to the visitation.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> L.A.O., Register 26, fols 43-4v.

<sup>20</sup> L.A.O., Dvj/24/4.

<sup>21</sup> P.R.O., SP 1/91, fols 7-16.

<sup>22</sup> L.A.O., Dean and Chapter wills, vol. II, fol. 10 [second numeration]; L.P., VII, 589(7). The oath followed the declaration of the southern convocation that the bishop of Rome had no greater jurisdiction in England than any foreign

Such a mandate had been issued so that the archbishop might use his visitation to secure the assent of certain clergy to an oath of the King's supremacy.<sup>23</sup> Richard Gwent, the archbishop's commissary, was armed with a royal commission to obtain such an oath.<sup>24</sup> The dean and chapter swore the oath on 25 August. In effect, they swore that the bishop of Rome had no more jurisdiction in England than any foreign bishop. They acknowledged that the King was head of the English church and promised to show obedience to the offspring of the union between the King and Anne Boleyn.<sup>25</sup>

In his protest, Longland demanded that the government reconsider the relationship between Church and State. His was not the only protest at the archbishop's visitation.

John Stokesley received the archbishop's inhibition for the metropolitical visitation on 19 May 1534. His Register for the diocese of London records:

xix<sup>o</sup> die Maii traditum erat mandatum Cant'  
archiepiscopi domino episcopo London' pro  
visitatione sua metropolitica habenda...<sup>26</sup>

The archiepiscopal style in the citation ran 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et apostolice

---

bishop. Cf. Gee and Hardy, Documents, p. 251. Professor Lehmborg gives a different analysis of the votes. Cf. Lehmborg, op. cit., pp. 213-14.

<sup>23</sup>For the general arrangements concerning the administration of the oath, cf. Elton, P & P, pp. 227-30.

<sup>24</sup>L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II, fol. 10v. [second numeration].

<sup>25</sup>P.R.O., E. 25. 79 pt 2. Cf. Seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of Public Records (London, 1846) [annotated copy in the Round Room of the P.R.O.], Appendix II, p. 291.

<sup>26</sup>Guildhall Library, Aldermanbury, London [henceforth cited as G.L.], MS. 9531/11 [John Stokesley's Register], fol. 28.

sedis legatus natus'.<sup>27</sup> At the start of the metropolitanical visitation in the diocese of London, the archbishop issued a protestation:

Nos Thomas Cranmer permissione divina Cant'  
archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et  
metropolitanus protestamur palam, publice et  
expresse quod per hanc nostram visitationem in  
ecclesia cathedrali domini Pauli London' et  
diocesis eiusdem iure metropolitico exercendam  
non intendimus nec volumus per eandem quicquid  
facere aut exercere in derogationem aut  
enarvationem potestatis regie aut aliquorum  
statutorum huius regni in ea parte editorum...<sup>28</sup>

He was careful to emphasise that he performed the visitation by right of his position as metropolitan and that he did not act in derogation of the rights of the King. This did not satisfy Stokesley. Professor Scarisbrick has shown that in 1530, writs of praemunire facias were issued in King's Bench against fifteen clerics for having acknowledged the jurisdiction of Wolsey as papal legate.<sup>29</sup> The archbishop's style as papal legate was used in his citation addressed to the bishop and Stokesley clearly took fright. As was the case at Lincoln, the administration of the oath of supremacy took place during the visitation. The London chapter swore the oath on 20 June 1534.<sup>30</sup> Dr Susan Brigden has shown that during the summer of 1534 the other religious corporations and

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., fols 59-60. It was despatched from Lambeth on 10 May.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., fol. 66v.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. J.J. Scarisbrick, 'The Pardon of the Clergy, 1531' in The Cambridge Historical Review, vol. XII(1956), pp. 25-8.

<sup>30</sup> L.P., VII, 865.

the parish clergy set their signatures and seals to the deliberation. Lists of 356 signatures from the London parish clergy exist.<sup>31</sup> No resistance was reported, although Edward Field submitted himself 'iudicio Cantuarie archipresulis, ordinarii mei'.<sup>32</sup> Under such pressure from the government, Stokesley was forced to protest against the archbishop's papal title.

On 30 May, the bishop of London issued the first of a number of protestations against the jurisdiction of the archbishop.<sup>33</sup> On 18 June, another protestation was made. The archbishop in person refused to include the protest amongst the acts of the visitation:

Idem reverendissimus pater Cant' archiepiscopus  
admittere, inactitare seu in actis suis redegi  
seu inferri non curavit sed easdem expresse  
reiecit.<sup>34</sup>

Two days later, a second attempt was made to visit the bishop. When this proved unsuccessful, the archbishop prorogued the visitation. Seven days later, the bishop of London issued another protestation.<sup>35</sup> As a result of his opposition to the visitation, Stokesley was inhibited from exercising further jurisdiction under pain of suspension ab ingressu ecclesie and certain officials were summoned to appear with

<sup>31</sup> S. Brigden, The Early Reformation in London, 1520-47: the conflict in the parishes (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1979), pp. 136-9.

<sup>32</sup> P.R.O., E. 36. 63, fol. 102; L.P., VII, 1052(2).

<sup>33</sup> G.L., MS. 9531/11, fols 61-2.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., fols 62v.-3v.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.



the bishop in consistory on 10 July. The archbishop complained that Stokesley had admitted Edmund Close 'virum omnino illiteratum, cui de iure aut ratione animarum cura committi non deberet' to the rectory of St George, Botolph Lane.<sup>36</sup>

More importantly, however, the bishop had empowered his officials to exercise jurisdiction. John Tendering 'an auctoritate, vice vel mandato dicti confratris nostri, an sua propria audacia vel temeritate' held sessions of the diocesan consistory court and Matthew Greston acted as registrar for the diocese.<sup>37</sup> The citation was executed on 29 June. Stokesley's Register, however, shows that nothing came of the case: 'nec aliquis processus fiebat ulterius...'.<sup>38</sup>

On 3 July, the bishop and his officers issued an appeal against the suspension and the citation.<sup>39</sup> On the same day, the archbishop issued a relaxatio of the inhibition which was to last until 1 September, provided that the archbishop's officers retained the power of visitation.<sup>40</sup> The bishop of London protested once again at the archbishop's jurisdiction. On 1 December, John Cockes the archbishop's commissary appeared in the chapter house at London. Stokesley was pronounced contumacious and the penalty was reserved until 18 March 1535. Stokesley's Register shows that nothing came of the case:

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., fols 65v.-6. The episcopal Register records that the archbishop's citation named the benefice as St Gregory's, Eastcheap, but this must be a mistake. Similarly, Close was not illiteratus, being a Magister and a bachelor of canon law from Oxford. Cf. A.B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford, A.D. 1501 to 1540 (Oxford, 1974), appendix of Magistri, sub nomine.

<sup>37</sup> G.L., MS. 9531/11, fols 65v.-6.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., fols 63v.-4v.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., fol. 66v.

'hoc xviii<sup>o</sup> die Martii nichil ulterius actum fuit'. The bishop of London, however, issued another appeal.<sup>41</sup> Stokesley was clearly threatened by Cranmer's jurisdiction. He certainly continued to exercise jurisdiction throughout the period. He himself performed ordinations on 29 May, 19 September, 19 December 1534 and 20 February 1535.<sup>42</sup>

Articles against the archbishop's jurisdiction which stem from this visitation also survive.<sup>43</sup> Annotations on the manuscript reveal that they concern the visitation of the archbishop of Canterbury within the diocese of London. This appeal was made to the King in chancery. Stokesley complained that in all the instruments concerning the visitation, the archbishop styled himself 'apostolicas sedis legatum'. The bishop and the chapter assert that before the day of the visitation, they informed the archbishop of their objections. On the day of the visitation itself, the bishop and chapter

made...a protestation...signifying, that they would neither accept him as such a legate, nor admit, nor obey his visitation, jurisdiction, nor any thing that he would attempt by the pretext or colour of that name of legate, or otherwise, against the crown of our sovereign, his regality, statutes, or customs of his realm.<sup>44</sup>

Stokesley maintained in his appeal to the King that

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., fol. 65.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., fol. 130-v.

<sup>43</sup>B.L., Cotton MS. Cleopatra F II, fols 124-7; printed in Strype, Cranmer, I, pp. 355-60.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 355.

all men learned and books of the canon law doth agree, that no metropolitan, or primate may thus, by any law written, suspend all the jurisdiction of the bishops, for the time of their visitations, or exercise the premises during the same "jure metropolitico".<sup>45</sup>

Stokesley continued his arguments against the archbishop by insisting that the suspension of jurisdiction 'seemeth to be against holy Scripture, and the authority given unto them by God'.<sup>46</sup> If it were to appear in any book that the archbishop's predecessors attempted to perform such visitations, they may have done so because they were papal legates. Some were also chancellors of England. This might have persuaded them to act as Wolsey did in performing acts which were illegal.<sup>47</sup> He continued:

...it appears by the ancient registers of the bishops and their churches, that when the predecessors of the archbishops did attempt any of these causes aforesaid, the bishops and their clergy did appeal to the see of Rome...In like manner...we, your faithful subjects, have now for this our grief appealed unto your majesty.<sup>48</sup>

Stokesley claimed that such jurisdiction was illegal by common law. He told the King that Cranmer's powers should be 'extinguished for ever' so that

the bishops of Rome hereafter shall have no colour to maintain and justify that they keep

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 356.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 357.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 358.

here yet, and continue the possession of their authority, and of our subjection by their legate.<sup>49</sup>

Stokesley concluded by saying that if Cranmer's jurisdiction were 'allowed...by your learned council...we shall then immediately in all the premises obey the said archbishop without any further contradiction'.<sup>50</sup> Professor Soarisbrick has shown that in the Pardon of the Clergy, the King had not yet fully resolved to destroy the power of the Pope in England.<sup>51</sup> By 1534, the English bishops saw that the position was far more menacing. In his appeals to the King in chancery, Stokesley fought to retain his integrity in the eyes of the government. He protested against the archbishop's papal title. Faced by the challenge presented by the oath of supremacy, Stokesley was forced to protest against the archbishop's jurisdiction. He was not the only diocesan bishop to strengthen his bulwarks against the attack.

Professor Scarisbrick has shown that one of the bishops mentioned in the original writs of praemunire facias, brought into the King's Bench in 1530, was Richard Nykke, bishop of Norwich.<sup>52</sup> He was charged with praemunire for acknowledging Wolsey's legatine jurisdiction. Nykke was a staunch conservative. In 1530, he wrote to archbishop Warham asking for advice in suppressing the reading of

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 359.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Soarisbrick, art. cit., passim.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., pp. 25-6.

heretical books in English.<sup>53</sup> The attack was renewed by the government in 1534. Early in February, Nykke was convicted on a bill exhibited by the attorney general in King's Bench on a charge of praemunire. His crime lay in citing the mayor of Thetford to appear before him, although the town of Thetford was immune from his spiritual jurisdiction. He paid a fine and was freed from prison. The pardon was confirmed by act of parliament.<sup>54</sup> Nykke was clearly under attack.

Later that year, Nykke faced Cranmer's metropolitical visitation. On 28 July 1534, William Meye appeared in the chapter house of Norwich cathedral to begin the archbishop's visitation. Meye read his letters of commission before the prior and convent. The bishop was then cited by Meye 'ter in capitulo. deinde ad hostium eiusdem'. Nykke did not appear: 'Quem sic...preconizatum, monitum, diuque expectatum et nullo modo comparentem pronunciaverit contumacem ac pene contumacie sue huiusmodi mod[e]rationem et declarationem eiusdem sibi pro loco et tempore congruis et oportunis reservaverit'.<sup>55</sup>

On 4 August, a citation was issued from Lambeth in the name of the archbishop. His style ran 'THOMAS

<sup>53</sup> Strype, Cranmer, I, pp. 341-2.

<sup>54</sup> L.P., VII, 48(2), 49, 158, 180, 262(18) and 270. Cf. Stat. Realm. III, pp. 486-7. Cf. also J.J. Scarisbrick, The Conservative Episcopate in England 1529-1535 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1955), pp. 283-91.

<sup>55</sup> C.R., fol. 137v. The record of the visitation is transcribed in the Appendix below.

permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus'.<sup>56</sup> Since the bishop of Norwich refused to obey the archbishop's citation, the bishop was warned to appear in the consistory court at Norwich on 25 September.<sup>57</sup> On 19 September, the certificate of execution for the second monition was delivered to Meye in the parish church of Little Walsingham.<sup>58</sup> On 25 September, Thomas Cappe appeared in consistory as proctor for the bishop of Norwich. He read a protestation:

Dico et propono quod vos commissarius pretensus antedictus fuistis et estis iudex omnino incompetens in hac parte, nullam penitus in dictum reverendum dominum meum habens iurisdictionem aut motionem saltem et legitimam, et talis quod coram quo non decet reverendum dominum meum comparere pro eo videlicet et ex eo quod persona vestra nulla dignitate fuit aut est fulcita aut aliter de iure qualificata, cuius pretextu dominus meus reverendus...non tenetur aliquo modo comparere vel respondere coram vobis maxime dicto reverendissimo patre Cant' archiepiscopo...<sup>59</sup>

He maintained:

Vos tamen maliciose et contra iuris dispositionem sepius et iteratis visibus publice iactitastis et comminati estis dictum reverendum dominum meum, in casu quo coram vobis minime comparuerit, suspendere vel excommunicare in ipsius domini

<sup>56</sup> C.R., loc. cit.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., fols 137v.-8.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., fol. 138.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., fol. 138v.

mei reverendi ac status et dignitatis sue  
scandalum, preiudicium et gravamen.<sup>60</sup>

When Meye heard Cappe's protestation, there was a prolonged discussion between Meye and certain lawyers. Before Meye could proceed further, Cappe read a second protestation. Since the archbishop would not allow his appeal,

...ne idem reverendissimus in Christo pater  
Cantuariensis archiepiscopus aut vos eius  
commissarius pretensus antedictus quicquam  
in preiudicium dicti domini mei aut status  
vel dignitatis sue pontificalis de cetero  
attemptet vel attemptetis...ad serenissimum  
in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum  
Henricum octavum Dei gracia Anglie et Francie  
Regem, fidei defensorem et Dominum Hibernie,  
totius ecclesie catholice Anglicane caput  
supremum in utraque huius regni convocatione  
concorditer recognitum pro dicto reverendo  
patre domino meo...a premissis gravaminibus  
appello...subjiciens dictum dominum meum...  
protectioni, tuicioni et defensionem dicti  
serenissimi Regis.<sup>61</sup>

Unlike Stokesley's protest, there is no evidence that Nykke objected to Cranmer's style as papal legate. Indeed, the acts in the archiepiscopal Register do not reveal that Cranmer used such a title in his visitation of the diocese of Norwich. It is true that the oath of supremacy was administered during the visitation. The dean and chapter of Norwich swore their obedience to the new order on 28 July.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., fol. 139.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

The instrument recording their assent is signed by the prior and 31 others.<sup>62</sup> The royal mandate forbidding resistance to the visitation certainly addressed the archbishop as papal legate, but there is no evidence that the letter was singled out by Nykke for special treatment.<sup>63</sup> Given the campaign which the government had conducted against Nykke, it seems clear that the bishop was forced to defend himself. Following the Pardon of the Clergy in 1531, Nykke felt that he could not accept Cranmer's metropolitcal visitation without admitting that Cranmer's authority stemmed from his bulls of papal provision.<sup>64</sup> The act of pardon excused the clergy for the mere fact of exercising spiritual jurisdiction.<sup>65</sup> Refusing to acknowledge the archbishop's jurisdiction, Nykke continued to exercise powers of administration in the diocese. On 18 and 19 September, the bishop of Chalcedon<sup>66</sup> held an ordination on the authority of the bishop of Norwich. Two men were ordained as subdeacons regular, three as deacons secular, two as deacons regular, two as secular priests and four as priests regular.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> L.P., VII, 1347(3).

<sup>63</sup> For the text of the mandate, cf. L.A.O., Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II, fol. 10[second numeration]; L.P., VII, 589(7).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. C.R., fols 1-5v.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Stat. Realm. III, 334-8.

<sup>66</sup> For the confusion over the identification of the bishop, cf. above p. 76 n. 74.

<sup>67</sup> N.N.R.O., ORR/1A, fols 22v.-3.



Following Cappe's protestation on 25 September, Meye asserted that the reasons given in Cappe's first schedule were 'non probabiles nec verisimiles'.<sup>68</sup> He cited Nykke once more and then pronounced him contumacious:

dicto reverendo patri, ob dictam contumaciam domino Richardo Norwicensi episcopo in penam contumacie sue huiusmodi ecclesie sue sacerdotale ministerium interdicimus in hiis scriptis, penam contumacie sue predictae in ea parte per presentes declarando et declaramus.<sup>69</sup>

The interdict, however, lasted less than ten days. On 3 October, Meye appeared in the chapter house of St Olave's priory in Suffolk. William Talmach, proctor, appeared for the bishop of Norwich and alleged that the reason for the bishop's absence was that he was old and infirm. He was 'visu corporali(disponente Domino) orbato et destituto, octogenarii et ultra, corporisque et virium confractorum'.<sup>70</sup> Talmach requested the sentence to be relaxed and promised that his master would undergo penance. Meye told Talmach that Nykke should appear in the parish church of Hoxne on 19 October. William Dale, prior of the priory of St Olave, then relaxed the interdict. On 19 October, the bishop duly appeared in the appointed parish church and Meye declared the reasons for his presence. The visitation was prorogued until 3 p.m.:

...tandem episcopus antedictus consentiit recipere dictum commissarium in visitatorem

<sup>68</sup> Cf. L.P.L., C.R., fol. 139.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., fol. 139v.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

seu alterum quemcumque nomine dicti  
reverendissimi ad eundem mittendum, finem  
negotii huiusmodi peracturum...<sup>71</sup>

Nothing else survives concerning Nykke's resistance.

The protests of all the bishops during Thomas Cranmer's metropolitical visitation were not against the King's supremacy. Rather, the prelates appealed to the King against the archbishop's exercise of metropolitical jurisdiction. In the protestation which the archbishop himself made at his visitation of the diocese of London, Cranmer claimed that his authority did not run 'in derogationem aut enarvationem potestatis regie aut aliquorum statutorum'.<sup>72</sup>

Stokesley protested against the use of the style apostolice sedis legatus. The charge was real. The opening document in the section of diverse littere in Thomas Cranmer's Register records the grant of a licence to Mary Guldeford, widow of Henry Guldeford, Kt, to have a private oratory within her manor. It is dated 13 February 1534.<sup>73</sup> The archiepiscopal style ran 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et apostolice sedis legatus'. Stokesley was correct when he claimed that 'per dicte legative potestatis usurpationem' there would arise 'maxima iniuria et intollerabile preiudicium tam sacre regie maiestati... quam etiam nobis'.<sup>74</sup> The immediate result of Stokesley's protest was important. During the prorogation of his

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., fol. 140.

<sup>72</sup>G.L., MS. 9531/11, fol. 66v.

<sup>73</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fol. 15

<sup>74</sup>G.L., MS. 9531/11, fols 62v.-3v.

visitation, Cranmer appeared in convocation on 4 November and announced a change in his archiepiscopal style.

He was now to be called metropolitanus, not apostolice sedis legatus.<sup>75</sup>

Thomas Cranmer's Register shows that Nykke at Norwich made a general protest against the archbishop's authority. He attempted to defend himself from an attack by the government. Longland of Lincoln appealed to the King, partly for defensive reasons, but also because he wished the government to clarify the new relationship between the primate and his province. Longland could not accept any notion that Cranmer's authority stemmed from his bulls of papal provision. There was no resistance to the oath of supremacy, but there was opposition to Cranmer's own claims for his authority as metropolitan. It was surely the bishops' protests of 1534 which led the government to realize that a new basis for the authority of the episcopate must be provided. Between February and June 1535, seventeen diocesan bishops made surrenders to the crown.<sup>76</sup> Those appointed by papal bull of provision handed in such documents and even those nominated by virtue of the statute of 1534 made a similar declaration.<sup>77</sup> Cranmer formally surrendered his bulls on 10 February 1535.<sup>78</sup> In doing so, he promised to give no oath of fealty to the

---

<sup>75</sup>Wilkins, Concilia, III, p. 769.

<sup>76</sup>Cf. P. Hughes, The Reformation in England, 3 vols (London, 1950-54), I, pp. 272-3.

<sup>77</sup>Stat. Realm, III, pp. 462-4; cf. L.P., VIII, 190, 311, 494, and 803.

<sup>78</sup>P.R.O., E 25. 26 pt 3; L.P., VIII, 190.

Pope. He swore to observe all statutes passed in derogation of the bishop of Rome's authority and to procure no further bulls from Rome.<sup>79</sup> The bishops protested in various ways against the archbishop's jurisdiction. Behind the protests of Nykke and Longland lay the government's motive in the creation of the Vice-Gerency. Dr Bowker noted that this was certainly the result of Longland's protest.<sup>80</sup> The date of Cromwell's commission as Vice-Gerent is unclear, but it may date from as early as December 1534.<sup>81</sup> Following the bishops' protests, it was clear that the government needed to furnish the episcopate with a new basis for its authority. With the surrender of papal bulls of provision and the issue from the Vice-Gerent's court of commissions for the exercise of their jurisdiction, such a demand was fully met. In September 1535, two of Cromwell's agents wrote to their master concerning the royal visitation of the dioceses by the Vice-Gerent. Thomas Legh and John ap Rice explained that the only way to demonstrate the King's supremacy in the church was 'yf he toke to his handes ones all iurisdiction and power and for a season or at his pleasure exercise the same'.<sup>82</sup> This was precisely the problem raised by Cranmer's visitation. Thomas Cranmer's Register, therefore, sheds important light

---

<sup>79</sup> An English translation of Gardiner's oath is given in Foxe, A & M, V, pp. 71-2.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Bowker, art. cit., pp. 227-35.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. S.E. Lehmberg, 'Supremacy and Vicegerency: a Re-examination' in E.H.R., CCCXIX (April, 1966), pp. 226-7.

<sup>82</sup> B.L. Cotton MS. Cleopatra E VI, fol. 262; L.P., IX, 424. For Cromwell's use of his office as Vice-Gerent, cf. above pp. 67-80.

upon the relationship between Church and State in the early years of his pontificate.

The remaining records of visitation within Thomas Cranmer's Register concern a visitation of All Souls College, Oxford, in 1541. The college had been founded by Henry Chichele in the fifteenth century.<sup>83</sup> Although technically in the diocese of Lincoln, the college had secured immunity from the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop by virtue of papal bulls from Eugenius IV. The Dispensations Act stressed that all licences obtained before 12 March 1533 were to be of full legal force.<sup>84</sup> The archbishop of Canterbury still claimed the right to visit the college, but such a privilege belonged to the see of Canterbury solely by virtue of the King's supremacy. In May 1541, the archbishop issued a commission for visitation to John Cockes. He performed the act 'auctoritate illustrissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri domini Henrici octavi[etc.] sufficienter et legitime suffultus'.<sup>85</sup> The college itself formally renounced papal supremacy on 28 September 1534.<sup>86</sup>

The archbishop first seems to have attempted a visitation of the college in April 1540.<sup>87</sup> Nothing concerning

<sup>83</sup> For a discussion of Chichele's aims in founding the college, cf. Chich. R., I, pp. liii-lvii.

<sup>84</sup> Stat. Realm, III, pp. 464-7.

<sup>85</sup> C.R., fol. 40-v.

<sup>86</sup> L.P., VII, 1216(32).

<sup>87</sup> An undated commission gives a partial date for visitation on Thursday, 22 April. During the years of Cranmer's archiepiscopate, 22 April fell on that day in 1535, 1540 and 1546. Cf. Handbook of Dates for Students of English History, ed. by C.R. Cheney (London, 1978), pp. 96 and 152. The commission is registered immediately after the acta for the visitation of 1541. Cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 54A-H.

the visitation survives at Lambeth or in Oxford. It is possible, however, that the date is a mistake for Friday, 22 April, for that day in 1541 witnessed the issue of a citation and inhibition to the warden and fellows ordering them to assemble in the chapel on 12 May.<sup>88</sup> The schedule of names returned to the archbishop's registry with the warden's certificate of execution lists fifty-three men duly cited.<sup>89</sup>

On 12 May, Walter Wryght acting as the archbishop's commissary appeared at the college. Wryght summoned all those cited and pronounced those absent contumacious, reserving the penalty until 31 May. He then announced that due to pressure of public business, the archbishop was unable to be present. He prorogued the visitation until 31 May.<sup>90</sup>

On 31 May, John Cokes and John Rokesby visited the college as commissaries of the archbishop.<sup>91</sup> The college statutes laid down that should the archbishop not be able to visit in person, only certain officials were to be his deputies. These were the prior and the sub-prior of Christ Church Canterbury, the official of the court of Canterbury or the dean of the arches.<sup>92</sup> The various commissions issued by the archbishop in 1541 name Walter Wryght and John Rokesby as dean of the arches<sup>93</sup> and John Cokes as official of the court of

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., fol. 41-v.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., fols 41v.-2.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., fol. 42-v. Wryght's commission is recorded in ibid., fol. 41.

<sup>91</sup> C.R., fol. 40-v.

<sup>92</sup> Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford: Statutes of All Souls College [henceforth cited as Statutes], 3 vols (London, 1853), I, p. 63.

<sup>93</sup> C.R., fols 40-1.

Canterbury.<sup>94</sup> The archbishop's Register does not reveal the identity of the dean of the arches at this date, but John Cokes was not appointed official of the court of Canterbury until 1543.<sup>95</sup> Clearly, the letter rather than the spirit of the law was observed.

The acta of the archbishop's visitation do not survive, but an important set of injunctions was issued at the close of the visitation in August.<sup>96</sup> It seems clear that the visitation was occasioned by the abuses to be found within the college. In the preamble to the injunctions, it was claimed:

multa comperimus isthuc enormiter fieri et  
secus quam vel statutorum vestrorum exigentia  
vel bonorum morum Regula, vel studiorum  
vestrorum ratio expostulent...<sup>97</sup>

The injunctions themselves are twenty-six in number. Within three days of the receipt of the injunctions, the warden was to summon all the fellows and scholars into the hall. There, he was to take an oath on the Gospels that he would observe and enforce the injunctions. The same oath was to be imposed on the deputy warden, the bursars, the deans and the remaining

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., fol. 40-v.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., fol. 51v.; cf. Appendix, Commissions and Letters, 61.

<sup>96</sup> C.R., fols 42v.-5v. The injunctions are printed from the Register in Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the period of the Reformation, ed. in 3 vols for The Alcuin Club by W.P.M. Kennedy and W.H. Frere (London, 1910), II, pp. 70-81. In the nineteenth century, a copy of the injunctions was printed from a MS. at All Souls College; cf. Statutes, I, pp. [3] and 77-85. This copy of the injunctions is dated 26 August 1541. The second injunction has sexaginta dies et alios for quadraginta dies et alios; the twenty-third injunction has ante receptionem for aut receptionem.

<sup>97</sup> Kennedy and Frere, op. cit., II, p. 70.



fellows and scholars on their admission to the society or to any office under pain of deprivation.<sup>98</sup>

The pastoral emphasis behind the archbishop's injunctions is clear. The original statutes of the college laid down that whenever there was a residue of the commons, it was to be retained for the common good of the college.<sup>99</sup>

The fourteenth injunction from the archbishop's Register deals with the same problem. The archbishop gave careful instructions that the fragments of food of the fellows and scholars and of the servants should be taken out of the college after each meal and distributed equally among the poor. Primarily, this is to be the duty of the manciple. Should this duty not be performed, one of the bursars was to levy a fine of 4d.<sup>100</sup>

The majority of the injunctions are concerned with matters of discipline and administration. In dealing with such matters, the archbishop's plan was twofold. He sought to reinforce the original statutes of the college. Where the punishment was too lax, he provided harsher penalties. The archbishop insisted that the fellows and scholars were to refrain from gluttony, drinking and other enormities.<sup>101</sup> During his visitation, the archbishop's commissaries discovered that the fellows and scholars had turned the

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., pp. 79-80.

<sup>99</sup> Statutes, p. 34.

<sup>100</sup> Kennedy and Frere, op. cit., p. 75.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., pp. 72-3.



college into a brothel. The original statutes laid down that any man discovered to be notorius fornicator was to be expelled immediately.<sup>102</sup> Cranmer laid down that after 1 October, children were not to be admitted to the college as servants. Similarly, if any fellow, scholar or servant were to allow any poor scholar or young boy to stay in his room at night, he was to be warned by the warden so that the boy should be expelled within three days, under pain of exclusion from the college for one month. The offending member of college was to be so excluded only after three warnings.<sup>103</sup>

In terms of educational reform, the archbishop was concerned to provide harsher penalties for infringements of the rules governing academic disputations. Chichele had drawn up rules.<sup>104</sup> Warham's injunctions during his visitation of 1519 had clarified such rules.<sup>105</sup> Cranmer's commissaries found such statutes were being ignored and they ordered that such rules were to be observed.<sup>106</sup> The founder's statutes laid down penalties for non-observance of the regulations. The first offence incurred a warning, whilst the second, third and fourth breaches of the statutes entailed loss of commons for one, two and four days respectively.<sup>107</sup> The archbishop believed that such penalties were insufficient, for he stipulated that any infringement of the statutes was

---

<sup>102</sup> Statutes, pp. 66-7.

<sup>103</sup> Kennedy and Frere, op. cit., pp. 75-6.

<sup>104</sup> Statutes, pp. 36-8.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., pp. 75-7.

<sup>106</sup> Kennedy and Frere, op. cit., pp. 73-4.

<sup>107</sup> Statutes, p. 38.

to entail immediate exclusion from the commons for one week.<sup>108</sup>

In administrative reforms, the extension of the archbishop's power appears forcefully. Concerning matters of discord, Chichele had laid down that all such suits were to be settled within the college.<sup>109</sup> Cranmer found that the lawyers resident in that foundation had been provoking dissension amongst their colleagues in matters of college business and politics. The archbishop therefore advocated that if any of the eight senior lawyers could not agree in matters of policy under the statute 'Quod in maioribus causis', he was to declare the reason for his opposition. If the warden, deputy warden and dean of the lawyers reject his cause, or if he himself offered no reason, the dissenter was to appear before the archbishop within ten days, under penalty of perpetual exclusion from the college. If the archbishop were to agree with the dissenting voices, the objectors themselves were to return to the college, and their expenses were to be paid by the college bursars. If the appeal were rejected, the dissenters were to pay their own expenses. They were to be banned from receiving any emolument from the college and to be restrained from receiving commons until they were able to agree with the warden and the rest.<sup>110</sup>

The visitation of All Souls College, Oxford, in

---

<sup>108</sup> Kennedy and Frere, loc. cit.

<sup>109</sup> Statutes, p. 46.

<sup>110</sup> Kennedy and Frere, op. cit., pp. 78-9.

1541 was a striking testament to the archbishop's determination to deepen the spirituality and educational outreach of the college whilst setting the administration of that body upon a firm foundation. In the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, the archbishop maintained that ecclesiastical visitors were to pay special attention to the state of discipline in each church. He talked of 'disciplina qualis ecclesiarum sit, et quantum habeat roboris'.<sup>111</sup> As early as 1540, however, Thomas Cranmer had come to embrace a measured concept of the importance of discipline. Inheriting the procedures of ecclesiastical visitation, the archbishop sought to use those techniques to instil his reformed ideas concerning spirituality and discipline at All Souls College, Oxford.

#### Sede Vacante administration

By the sixteenth century, the practice whereby the archbishop of Canterbury claimed the right to administer the spiritualities of the vacant sees of his province was firmly established.<sup>112</sup> The earliest surviving example of acta vacationis in the Canterbury Registers occurs in 1326 in Reynold's Register.<sup>113</sup> Within Thomas Cranmer's Register, the earliest surviving records of sede vacante administration form a group of nine institutions to benefices in the diocese

<sup>111</sup> R.L.E., p. 132.

<sup>112</sup> For the background to such jurisdiction, cf. Churchill, Administration, vol. I, pp. 161-240 and II, pp. 41-118.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. ibid., I, pp. 221-2.

of St Asaph in 1535 and 1536.<sup>114</sup> Records survive within the sections of the Register devoted to the administration of vacant sees, convocation business and diverse littere for Hereford(1538), London(1539), Bangor(1541), St David's(1548), Gloucester(1549), Norwich(1550), London(1550), Rochester(1550), Winchester(1551), Rochester(1551), Lincoln(1551), Worcester(1551), Chichester(1551), Hereford(1552), Rochester(1552), and Bangor(1553).<sup>115</sup> Institutions sede vacante are also recorded in the section of Canterbury institutions. Records survive for the vacancies at St Asaph(1535), Hereford(1538), Salisbury(1539), Worcester(1539), Bangor(1541), Chichester(1543), Coventry and Lichfield(1543), Rochester(1544), Llandaff(1545), Worcester(1544), Lincoln(1547), and Bath and Wells(1547).<sup>116</sup> Save institutions, few records survive for the reign of Henry VIII, although it is clear that returns were made to the archbishop's registry for certain vacancies. The Register is fullest for the period 1547-53. The records themselves are by no means complete. The record of the vacancy in the diocese of St Asaph in 1535 contains no more than nine institutions to benefices.<sup>117</sup> The records of the vacancy in the diocese of Worcester in 1551 contain the intimation from the dean and chapter of Worcester that the see is void, the archbishop's

<sup>114</sup> C.R., fol. 358-v. The institutions are calendared in A.J. Edwards, The sede vacante Administration of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer 1533-53 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the M. Phil. degree, university of London, 1968), pp. 149-50.

<sup>115</sup> C.R., fols 89-104v., 29-v., 23-4, 33v.-4, 105-7v., 107v.-15, 115v.-19 and 12v.-13, 119-20v., 120v.-21, 121-v., 121v.-8, 128-9v., 129v.-32, 132-4, 134-6 and 136-v. respectively.

<sup>116</sup> C.R., fols 358-v., 365v., 381v., 368 and 381, 382v., 388 and 391, 387, 391-2, 394v., 391, 405A-6 and 409v.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., fol. 358-v.

commission to the keepers of the spirituality sede vacante and five institutions to benefices.<sup>118</sup> The vacancy in the see of London in 1539 is represented by the commission for the exercise of jurisdiction sede vacante, which has been wrongly registered among the diverse littere.<sup>119</sup> Matthew Parker was metropolitan of the province of Canterbury between 1559 and 1575, yet the records of the acts sede vacante for those years are much fuller than the documents recorded in Thomas Cranmer's Register.<sup>120</sup> It is true that there are instances where few records have been recorded for a vacancy. The records of the vacancy for the see of Worcester in 1570 comprise the certificate from the dean and chapter concerning the vacancy, the commission to the dean of Worcester to exercise jurisdiction, four institutions to benefices and a record concerning probate jurisdiction: 'Memorandum thactes and testamentes for this vacacion are written in an other Booke'.<sup>121</sup> The vacancy in the see of Chichester, however, which was caused by the death of William Barlow is very fully recorded. The record begins with commissions for the exercise of jurisdiction in the archdeaconry of Lewes and the diocese of Chichester. There follows a commission to the dean of Hastings to levy synodals. There is a record of the acta concerning the payment of a

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., fols 128-9v.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., fol. 29-v.

<sup>120</sup> Registrum Matthei Parker: diocesis Cantuariensis, A.D. 1559-1575, transcribed and edited by E.M. Thompson and W.H. Frere, 3 vols (Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33)

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., I, pp. 298-301.

mortuary due to the archbishop on the death of the bishop of Chichester. A letter from the archbishop for a view of armour also occurs. There are records concerning the punishment of excommunicants, the death of rectors, the sequestration of the fruits of benefices, records of institutions to benefices and of probate jurisdiction.<sup>122</sup> Apart from the single record of the vacancy in the diocese of Hereford in 1538,<sup>123</sup> no record sede vacante in Thomas Cranmer's Register is so fully recorded.

It is not until the archiepiscopate of Bourghier that the definite appointment of a registrar sede vacante is found. Archbishop Warham included the demand in five of his sede vacante commissions.<sup>124</sup> Cranmer also adopted the practice.<sup>125</sup> It was the duty of the scribe to send a copy of the acta sede vacante to the archbishop's registry. The lack of such records in the Register of Thomas Cranmer is clearly explained by the failure of his subordinates to receive such material in the registry or to incorporate it into the volume. It is clear, however, that records survive in diocesan registries. At Hereford, a vacancy Register exists which has been bound in with the Registers of Charles Booth, Edward Fox and Edmund Bonner.<sup>126</sup> The

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., pp. 260-87.

<sup>123</sup> C.R., fols 89-104v.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, p. 217; II, p. 109.

<sup>125</sup> Cf., for example, C.R., fols 89v.-90v.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Smith, Registers, p. 101.

mortuary due to the archbishop on the death of the bishop of Chichester. A letter from the archbishop for a view of armour also occurs. There are records concerning the punishment of excommunicants, the death of rectors, the sequestration of the fruits of benefices, records of institutions to benefices and of probate jurisdiction.<sup>122</sup> Apart from the single record of the vacancy in the diocese of Hereford in 1538,<sup>123</sup> no record sede vacante in Thomas Cranmer's Register is so fully recorded.

It is not until the archiepiscopate of Bourghier that the definite appointment of a registrar sede vacante is found. Archbishop Warham included the demand in five of his sede vacante commissions.<sup>124</sup> Cranmer also adopted the practice.<sup>125</sup> It was the duty of the scribe to send a copy of the acta sede vacante to the archbishop's registry. The lack of such records in the Register of Thomas Cranmer is clearly explained by the failure of his subordinates to receive such material in the registry or to incorporate it into the volume. It is clear, however, that records survive in diocesan registries. At Hereford, a vacancy Register exists which has been bound in with the Registers of Charles Booth, Edward Fox and Edmund Bonner.<sup>126</sup> The

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., pp. 260-87.

<sup>123</sup> C.R., fols 89-104v.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, p. 217; II, p. 109.

<sup>125</sup> Cf., for example, C.R., fols 89v.-90v.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Smith, Registers, p. 101.



Register is headed 'Registrum...Magistri Hugonis Coren...in civitate et diocese Herefordie, sede episcopali ibidem per obitum bone memorie domini Edwardi Foxe nuper Herefordensis Episcopi vacante'.<sup>127</sup> The record contains a copy of his commission, records concerning the purgation of clerici convicti and the abjuration of a heretic and fifteen institutions to benefices.<sup>128</sup> Similar records exist elsewhere. Vacancies in the see of Lincoln have left little trace in the records there for the period of Thomas Cranmer's archiepiscopate. Material, however, does survive among the records contained in the dean and chapter act books regarding the nomination of an official sede vacante in 1547.<sup>129</sup> Such records are a valuable supplement to those contained in Thomas Cranmer's own Register. All such surviving acta, however, still do not form a complete record of the archbishop's administration sede vacante. They do, nevertheless, give glimpses of the relationship between the metropolitan and the dioceses of the southern province under the jurisdiction of the King as supreme head.

Miss Churchill has shown that the archbishops of Canterbury claimed to administer the sees of their province sede vacante by virtue of their metropolitan authority.<sup>130</sup> In 1355, for example, Islep issued a

<sup>127</sup> Registrum Caroli Bothe, episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MDXVI-MDXXXIV, ed. by A.T. Bannister (Cantilupe and Canterbury and York Societies, 28, 1921), p. 381.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., pp. 381-2.

<sup>129</sup> Chapter Acts of the Cathedral Church of St Mary of Lincoln A.D. 1520-1559, ed. by R.E.G. Cole (Lincoln Record Society, 12-13, 15, 1915-20), 13, pp. 145-9.

<sup>130</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, p. 161.



commission to Walter de Eluedene as official in the diocese of Norwich sede vacante. The archiepiscopal style ran 'Simon permissione divina Cantuariensis archiepiscopus, totius Anglie Primas et apostolice sedis legatus'.<sup>131</sup> The symbol of the archbishop's metropolitical authority was the delivery to him of the pallium. By the sixteenth century, the delivery of the pallium was directly associated with the profession of obedience to the Holy See. For the consecration of Thomas Cranmer, the pallium was delivered to the archbishop of York and to the bishop of London. They were directed to ensure that the archbishop elect despatch to the Pope the oath of loyalty according to the prescribed form.<sup>132</sup> In the form of words to be used at the bestowal of the pallium, the sole earthly authority accredited with power to bestow that garment is Clement VII himself. The pallium signified the 'plenitudinem...pontificalis officii'.<sup>133</sup> At his consecration in St Stephen's chapel, Westminster, Cranmer swore the oath of loyalty to the Holy See at his receipt of the pallium:

...idem reverendissimus pater dominus Thomas Cant' archiepiscopus ante dictum summum altare pallium recepturus...iuramentum...prestitit et iuravit.<sup>134</sup>

Thomas Cranmer protested that he did not consider the form

<sup>131</sup>Cf. ibid., II, pp. 70-2.

<sup>132</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fol. 4.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid., fol. 5-v.

of the oath of loyalty to be binding. In law, nonetheless, he had received promotion to the see of Canterbury by the issue of a bull of papal provision from the Holy See.<sup>135</sup>

Following his consecration, commissions were issued to the archbishop's officials for the exercise of their jurisdiction. On the day of his consecration, a commission was directed to Richard Gwent and David Poole and to Richard Strete as vicars delegate, commissaries general and custodians of the spirituality in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield. The see was vacant by the death of Geoffrey Blyth. The archbishop's style ran:

THOMAS permissione divina Cantuariensis  
archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et  
apostolice sedis legatus, ad quem omnis et  
omnimoda iurisdicatio spiritualis et ecclesiastica,  
que ad episcopum Coven' et Lich' pertinet sede  
plena, ipsa sede iam vacante notorie dinoscitur  
pertinere...<sup>136</sup>

Jurisdiction was said to belong to the archbishop sede vacante 'de iure, prerogativa et consuetudine'. The terms of the commission are very full. The keepers of the spirituality were empowered to visit the diocese with powers of correction, to celebrate synods, to examine elections, to institute and induct clerks into benefices, to authorize ordinations, to enquire into appropriations, to prove wills, to purge clerici convicti and to do all else necessary.<sup>137</sup>

<sup>135</sup> Cf. above, pp. 166-90.

<sup>136</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fol. 143v. with pertinent for pertinet.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., fols 143v.-6.

It was the bishops' protests during the archbishop's metropolitocal visitation of 1534 which convinced the government that a new basis must be sought for the authority of the episcopate.<sup>138</sup> In his protest, Longland refused to accept that the archbishop's jurisdiction might stem from his papal bulls of provision. In the commission issued to the keepers of the spirituality in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, Cranmer's archiepiscopal style was clearly redolent of such an interpretation. It was the royal visitation of 1535 which provided the new basis for episcopal authority.<sup>139</sup> Yet, the commission which the archbishop received in October 1535 did not explicitly mention sede vacante jurisdiction.<sup>140</sup> Cromwell's use of his office as Vice-Gerent did not allow an immediate resumption by the archbishop of his powers sede vacante.<sup>141</sup> Following the royal visitation, the first surviving commission issued by the archiepiscopal registry was that drawn up for the administration of the diocese of Hereford sede vacante in 1538. The wording of the commission was in common form throughout.<sup>142</sup> On 11 September 1539, however, a commission was issued to John Incent as keeper of the spirituality in the

<sup>138</sup> Cf. above, pp. 260-81.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. above, pp. 70-3.

<sup>140</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fol. 98-v. Cranmer is not addressed as metropolitan, but as 'predilecto cancellario[sic] nostro Thome Cant' archiepiscopo'. Certainly, the commission was intended to embrace Cranmer's powers as metropolitan since he was empowered to prove wills according to the customs of the prerogative court of Canterbury.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. above, pp. 74-7.

<sup>142</sup> C.R., fols 98v.-90v.

diocese of London sede vacante. The preamble to the commission gives eloquent testimony to the new source of the archbishop's authority for his sede vacante jurisdiction :

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus,  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus ad infra  
scripta per illustrissimum in Christo principem  
et dominum nostrum dominum Henricum octavum Dei  
gracia Anglie et Francie Regem, fidei defensorem,  
Dominum Hibernie et in terra supremum caput  
Anglicane ecclesie sufficienter auctorizatus... <sup>143</sup>

Clearly, the archbishop's metropolitanical authority was seen to rest explicitly upon the King's supremacy within the church. The insight was sustained in the reign of Edward VI. Following the accession of the young King in 1547, commissions were issued once more to the bishops for the exercise of their jurisdiction. Cranmer received his commission in February 1547.<sup>144</sup> In April 1548, a commission was issued to Ellis Price as keeper of the spirituality in the diocese of St David's sede vacante. The preamble ran:

THOMAS permissione divina Cantur' archiepiscopus,  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus ad  
quem, mediante auctoritate illustrissimi et  
invictissimi in Christo principis et domini  
nostri domini Edwardi sexti Dei gracia Anglie,  
Francie et Hibernie Regis, fidei defensoris et  
in terra ecclesie Anglicane et Hibernice

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., fol. 29-v.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., fols 28v.-9. The terms of the commission are identical to those in the commission issued by Henry VIII. The commission of 1547 is also recorded in B.L., Add. MS. 48022, fols 98v.-9; Wilkins, Concilia, IV, pp. 2-3.

supremi capitis omnis et omnimoda iurisdictio  
spiritualis et ecclesiastica que ad episcopum  
Menevensem sede plena pertinuit ipsa sede  
iam...vacante notorie dinoscitur pertinere... <sup>145</sup>

As Henry VIII told Cranmer in 1533 when he commissioned him to try his marital cause with Catherine of Aragon, 'ye be, under us, by Goddis calling and owers, the moste pryncipall mynyster of our spirituall jurisdiction'. <sup>146</sup>

Surviving evidence indicates that there was little resistance to the archbishop's jurisdiction. There was, however, some disruption in the administration of the diocese of Ely in 1533. In October of that year, the archbishop wrote to Audley, the lord chancellor, concerning the dispute. William Meye, the archbishop's vicar general sede vacante, had complained that since one Dr Clyff and others

keepeth away from him the records and registers belonging unto his office, he cannot in divers matters and causes minister justice accordingly... <sup>147</sup>

Since there was no other way to obtain them, Cranmer asked the lord chancellor to summon the parties before a sergeant of arms to compel them to surrender the registers. Further details were unfortunately to be transmitted by the messenger by word of mouth. Nothing survives concerning the protest among the muniments of the bishop and the dean and chapter at Ely. It seems likely, however, that the refusal to hand

<sup>145</sup> C.R., fols 33v.-4.

<sup>146</sup> St. P., I, ii, p. 393.

<sup>147</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 264.

over the documents stemmed not from objections to the jurisdiction of the archbishop, but from disputes with the King as custodian of the temporalities sede vacante.

The archbishop's letter to the chancellor is dated 24 October. Earlier in the same month, the prior of Ely had complained to Cromwell that the priory, not the King, held the privilege of collecting revenues sede vacante. Cromwell had evidently decided that he could enhance the King's income by imposing direct control over the collection of sede vacante revenues.<sup>148</sup>

Although the case at issue did not directly concern the administration of the spiritualities of the diocese, the disruption in the patterns of administration does seem to have affected the records of spiritual jurisdiction. No record of the administration of the see sede vacante was incorporated into the archbishop's Register at Lambeth. In this case, at least, the absence of records can be explained in such a way.

The central document recorded in the archbishop's Register for the exercise of such jurisdiction is the commission to the official sede vacante. For the vacancy in the see of Hereford in 1538, the keeper of the spiritualities was Hugh Coren. On 13 May in the chapel of Lea in the parish of Linton, Thomas Baynham presented the commission to Coren. Coren asked the scribe of the acts to read the commission publicly. This done, Coren performed his first official

---

<sup>148</sup> L.P., VI, 1244; cf. ibid. 1494. Cf. also F. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 107-8.

act by appointing William Marble and William Chell as his deputies.<sup>149</sup>

Following disputes concerning the exercise of jurisdiction sede vacante, the administration of vacant sees followed no uniform pattern. During the episcopate of Boniface, compositions were reached for the archbishop's jurisdiction in the sees of Lincoln, London, Salisbury and Worcester.<sup>150</sup> At Norwich, a composition was reached in the fourteenth century.<sup>151</sup> The remaining sees possessed no such agreement concerning the exercise of sede vacante jurisdiction. The earliest type of the latter commission to survive in the archbishop's Register is that recorded for the administration of the diocese of Hereford in 1538. Issued to Hugh Coren, the commission empowered him to visit the city and diocese of Hereford and to punish crimes, to celebrate synods, to confirm elections, and to institute clerks into benefices, to license any bishop to perform ordinations, to prove wills, to claim clerici convicti from secular magistrates, to receive spiritualia and to do all else necessary.<sup>152</sup> In 1550, Gabriel Donne was appointed as official sede vacante in the diocese of London. It was customary for all officials sede vacante to offer an oath of loyalty to the archbishop.<sup>153</sup> Following the extirpation of Roman jurisdiction, the official was to swear both an oath

<sup>149</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 89.

<sup>150</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 161-93; II, pp. 41-61.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., I, pp. 194-207; II, pp. 61-79.

<sup>152</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 89v.-90v.

<sup>153</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, p. 164.



of loyalty and the oath of supremacy to the King. In February 1550, William Cooke the archbishop's vicar general was commissioned to receive such an oath. The form of the oath is recorded in the archbishop's Register:

Ego...iuro quod fidelitatem domino nostro Regi de legibus et statutis huius incoliti regni Anglie debitam exhibebo, necnon quod renunciabo, refutabo et recusabo Romano Pontifici eiusque auctoritati et iurisdictioni usurpatis...<sup>154</sup>

The supremacy of the King in the archbishop's jurisdiction sede vacante is stated with some simplicity. The remainder of the oath was more traditional. The official swore to exercise his office faithfully, not to oppress the citizens of the diocese, and to make account of all payments made to him.<sup>155</sup> In terms of the jurisdiction exercised by officials in dioceses not governed by mediaeval composition, therefore, the pattern of administration was similar to that exercised in earlier years with the crucial exception that the archbishop's metropolitical jurisdiction now stemmed from the King.

Within the archbishop's Register, five commissions were issued to the keepers of the spirituality in sees where the exercise of jurisdiction sede vacante was regulated by a

<sup>154</sup>L.P.L., C.R., fol. 116-v.

<sup>155</sup>Ibid. The terms of this part of the oath are similar to those sworn by the official sede vacante in the diocese of London in 1522. Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, p. 181. According to the strict terms of the composition, the official was to swear to execute his office faithfully and that he would not oppress the inhabitants of the diocese. The composition laid down that the official was to swear an oath to the dean and chapter that he would preserve the rights of the church. Cf. Churchill, Administration, II, p. 48. No trace of this oath survives in Thomas Cranmer's Register.



mediaeval composition. The commissions are recorded for the vacancies at London in 1539, Norwich in 1550, London once more in 1550, Lincoln in 1551 and Worcester in 1551.<sup>156</sup> The London composition demanded that the dean and chapter should nominate three or four of their canons to the archbishop, one of whom was to be chosen as official sede vacante.<sup>157</sup> In 1539, the see of London fell vacant following the death of John Stokesley. Accordingly, the dean and chapter nominated John Royston, William Greene and John Incent as official to exercise jurisdiction 'iuxta formam compositionis inter...dominum Bonifacium, quondam Cant' archiepiscopum...ac decanum et capitulum dicte ecclesie cathedralis'.<sup>158</sup> The archbishop issued a commission to John Incent and stressed that he was to exercise jurisdiction 'iuxta formam compositionis'.<sup>159</sup> In this case, the stipulations of the mediaeval composition were faithfully observed.

Miss Churchill has shown that in the late fifteenth century, the mediaeval compositions governing jurisdiction sede vacante were not faithfully observed in all respects. The Norwich composition stipulated that the archbishop might appoint an official at will, but that the prior and chapter were to nominate three names to the archbishop from whom he was to select one to exercise the powers of visitation.<sup>160</sup> During the pontificate of cardinal Morton, Roger Church was

<sup>156</sup> C.R., fols 29-v., 107v.-9, 115v.-17, 121v.-2 and 128-9.

<sup>157</sup> Churchill, Administration, II, pp. 47-54.

<sup>158</sup> C.R., fol. 29-v.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., fol. 29v.

<sup>160</sup> Churchill, Administration, II, pp. 61-79.

appointed as keeper of the spirituality. Roger Framyngnam was to exercise powers of visitation. Such an arrangement is to be expected under the terms of the composition, although the petition of the prior and chapter concerning Framyngnam's appointment does not survive. Framyngnam, however, deputed his rights of visitation to Church and this was ratified by the common seal of the prior and chapter. In spirit, there were still two sources of authority. In practice, however, there was one.<sup>161</sup> There were also occasions where the letter of the composition might be broken. At London in 1522, the archbishop appointed a suffragan to hold ordinations, thereby apparently breaking the composition which governed the administration of the diocese sede vacante. The composition allocated this power to the dean and chapter.<sup>162</sup>

Such attempts to modify the patterns of administration help to explain the form of commissions issued for the exercise of jurisdiction in the dioceses of Norwich in 1550 and at Worcester in 1552. In both cases, the archbishop managed to appoint men as officials in addition to those stipulated by the composition. His actions appear most forcefully at Norwich and his Register gives striking testimony to a lost opportunity to modify existing practices.

On 31 January 1550, the dean and chapter of Norwich certified that the see was vacant following the resignation

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., I, pp. 206-7.

<sup>162</sup> Churchill, op. cit., I, p. 181 and II, p. 50.

of William Repps. According to their composition, they nominated three men as visitor and requested that the archbishop choose one of them to exercise such jurisdiction.<sup>163</sup> A contemporary hand has annotated the Norwich sede vacante records for this vacancy in an interesting way. The author has pointed out that the monastic cathedral at Norwich was dissolved under Henry VIII and that a new set of statutes was issued under Edward VI. Although Cranmer observed the terms of the mediaeval composition governing sede vacante jurisdiction, such an act was performed in ignorance. The marginal annotation is in English and seems to date from the years following Cranmer's deprivation. The author pointed out that the composition was of no value 'at this daie' and did not bind Cranmer's successors. Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's registry certainly lost an important opportunity to modify existing patterns of administration. At Norwich, an incomplete set of statutes, thought to be those given by Henry VIII, survives. They contain no mention of sede vacante jurisdiction.<sup>164</sup> The Edwardine statutes do not survive at all. Edward's charter, dated November 1547, reconstitutes the chapter with one dean, six prebendaries and other necessary ministers.<sup>165</sup> Despite the re-foundation of the cathedral, Thomas Cranmer complied with the terms of

<sup>163</sup> C.R., fol. 107v.

<sup>164</sup> N.N.R.O., dean and chapter muniments: Liber Miscellaneorum 2, pp. 23-53. A copy of the charter granted by the King is to be found in N.N.R.O., dean and chapter muniments: Chartae et Statuta Ecclesiae Cathedralis Norwicensis [unclassified], pp. 1-6.

<sup>165</sup> Cf. ibid., pp. 14-18.

the mediaeval composition. Following the nomination of three men by the dean and chapter, the archbishop selected John Salisbury, suffragan bishop of Thetford and dean, as commissary in the archbishop's visitation. He was to renounce the supremacy of the bishop of Rome and to swear to exercise his jurisdiction according to the composition between the churches of Canterbury and Norwich. The keepers of the spirituality sede vacante were Roland Taylor and William Wakefeld. The text of their commission does not survive at Lambeth or in Norwich. Nevertheless, the archbishop also granted them a commission identical to that granted to Salisbury for exercising powers of visitation. Both Taylor and Wakefeld in the latter commission were to swear to exercise jurisdiction 'de compositione reali in hac parte inter ecclesias metropolitancam Cantuariensem et cathedralem Norwicensem'.<sup>166</sup> The fragmentary records within the Lambeth Register show that all three men exercised powers of visitation jointly. The citation for visitation addressed to the dean and chapter named all three as the archbishop's commissaries.<sup>167</sup> The records show that oaths were required from all three men.<sup>168</sup> The letter of the mediaeval composition had certainly been broken for the archbishop's commissaries now enjoyed the rights of visitation. In practice, however, their newly won authority was less than that enjoyed by Church under Arundel since Church did not share his rights of visitation with

---

<sup>166</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 107-8v.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid., fol. 109.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid., fols 108v.-9.

Framyngham, who had been nominated by the prior and chapter. The archbishop, however, certainly managed to appoint visitors who were sympathetic to his reformed views. William Wakefeld was collated to the rectory of Chartham in 1544, when he was described as a chaplain of the archbishop.<sup>169</sup> Taylor was also a chaplain to the archbishop before 1540. He was a convinced reformer and was made a prebendary of Rochester cathedral in 1547. He was burned for heresy in 1555.<sup>170</sup> Despite such appointments, however, Thomas Cranmer was unable to modify the mediaeval composition governing the exercise of jurisdiction sede vacante. Despite the re-foundation of the cathedral, the pattern of administration sede vacante was not significantly different from that of his mediaeval forbears.

Although the commissions to the keepers of the spirituality sede vacante are fully recorded within the archbishop's Register, the records of the exercise of the powers deputed to them do not survive in all cases. At Hereford in 1538, the most important act performed by the keeper of the spiritualities was the publication of the two sets of royal injunctions during his visitation.<sup>171</sup> The archbishop's commissary, however, exercised further powers. He certainly used his authority to purge clerici convicti. In June 1538, a citation was issued summoning objectors to

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., fol. 393v.

<sup>170</sup> D.N.B., sub nomine; J.M. Horn, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1541-1857, III, p. 63.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. above, pp. 93-5.

the purgation of three lay clerks, Robert Farley, Roger Brome and Roger Haye, to appear before the commissary. All three had been indicted for theft. Farley had broken into the house of Maud Pelter, widow, in December 1537. He stole one sheet worth 4s 5d and one diaper towel worth 3s 4d. Since no opposers appeared, Coren imposed an oath upon the accused to tell the truth, whereupon they swore their innocence and produced twelve clerks as compurgators. Coren accepted their purgation and issued definitive sentences, releasing them from prison.<sup>172</sup>

Coren also used his authority to reach an agreement concerning the ownership of certain tithes between William Bradock, vicar of the parish church of Cleobury Mortimer, and David Cowper, rector of the parish church of Ribbesford.<sup>173</sup> The causes of the dispute are not recorded. Due to the length of the dispute, the expense of litigation and the benefit which would accrue to the inhabitants, who live a long way from Cleobury Mortimer, the tithes from the places under dispute are to belong to the church at Ribbesford and not to the church of Cleobury Mortimer. With the agreement of the patrons of both churches, the composition was ratified on the authority of the archbishop.

Little probate material survives within the archbishop's Register. The keeper of the spirituality's activity in such matters is attested by the records for the

<sup>172</sup> C.R., fols 94-5.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., fols 95-6v. Documents, p. 149.

<sup>174</sup> H.L.C., E.P.R., Liber B, folo 81-127v.

<sup>175</sup> The number of wills, in which the time taken is stated



vacancy in the diocese of Hereford in 1538. Eight wills are registered; all the bequests are commonplace.<sup>174</sup> Probate material also survives among the records of the dioceses of Lincoln and Rochester.<sup>175</sup> Dr Bowker has shown that at Lincoln, there were few delays in granting probate.<sup>176</sup> The Commons Supplication of 1532 complained of long delays in the probate of wills.<sup>177</sup> At Ely, a record of probate sede vacante has survived among the consistory court probate acta for the period following the death of Nicholas West. Although information concerning the death of the testator is lacking, it is possible to investigate the complaint of the Commons by using the date of probate and the date when the will itself was drawn up.<sup>178</sup>

Time taken in granting probate during the  
vacancy in the see of Ely 1533-34.

<u>Time taken</u>	<u>Number of wills</u>
Under one month	21
Over one and up to two months	11
Over two and up to three months	3
Over three and up to four months	0
Over four and up to five months	0
Over five months	11
Unclear <sup>179</sup>	16
<u>Total</u>	<u>62</u>

<sup>174</sup>Ibid., fols 101-4v.

<sup>175</sup>Ibid., fols 127v.-8 and 135-6.

<sup>176</sup>M. Bowker, The Henrician Reformation: the diocese of Lincoln under John Longland 1521-1547 (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 51-2.

<sup>177</sup>Cf. Gee and Hardy, Documents, p. 149.

<sup>178</sup>U.L.C., E.P.R., Liber H, fols 81-123v.

<sup>179</sup>The number of wills, in which the time taken to grant

From the Table, it is clear that over half the wills were proved in under three months. This is similar to the picture which Dr Bowker found in the archdeaconry of Lincoln for the year 1530. In a sample of fifty wills, she found that 29 were proved in a similar period.<sup>180</sup> In an analysis for the probate activity in the consistory court at Norwich, Dr Houlbrooke took a sample of fifty wills for the period 1520-21. He found that 50% were proved in less than two months. In 1570, the figure was 48%.<sup>181</sup> Clearly, probate administration sede vacante did not greatly differ from such jurisdiction sede plena. It does not seem that the complaint of the Commons can be substantiated from existing records.

One of the most important powers possessed by the archbishop sede vacante was the right to institute clerks into vacant benefices. The commission to Hugh Coren as keeper of the spirituality sede vacante in the diocese of Hereford in 1538 explicitly gave him powers to institute and induct clerks into benefices.<sup>182</sup> The archbishop's Register records that thirteen such institutions were made throughout the vacancy.<sup>183</sup> Two further institutions are recorded in the sede vacante Register at Hereford.<sup>184</sup> Coren himself seems

---

probate is unclear, is rather large. In six cases, the exact date when the will was drawn up is not recorded. In a further five, no probate date is given.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. Bowker, op. cit., p. 52.

<sup>181</sup> R. Houlbrooke, Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation 1520-1570 (Oxford, 1979), p. 96.

<sup>182</sup> C.R., fols 89v.-90v.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., fols 92v.-3v. and 365v.

<sup>184</sup> Registrum Caroli Bothe, episcopi Herefordensis, A.D.



to have performed the institutions in Hereford. In only one case, that of the institution of George Baker to the vicarage of More, is it explicitly asserted that the institution was performed at Lambeth. During the vacancy in the diocese of Gloucester in 1549, the commission to John Williams as keeper of the spirituality likewise allowed him to institute and induct clerks into benefices.<sup>185</sup> Yet, seven of the nineteen institutions recorded in the archbishop's Register are explicitly noted as being made at Lambeth.<sup>186</sup> The see of Chichester fell vacant in 1551 following the deprivation of George Day. A commission was issued to John Worthiall and Robert Taylor as keepers of the spirituality.<sup>187</sup> Despite the fact that they were empowered to institute and induct clerks into benefices, eight of the nine institutions recorded in the archbishop's Register are explicitly noted as being made at Lambeth.<sup>188</sup>

The same is true of sees governed by composition.

The commission to the keepers of the spirituality sede vacante

---

MDXVI-MDXXXV, ed. by A.T. Bannister (Canterbury and York Society, 28, 1921), pp. 381-2. The institutions are calendared in A.J. Edwards, The sede vacante Administration of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer 1533-53 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the M. Phil. degree, university of London, 1968), pp. 155-7; cf. ibid., pp. 21-51. Mr Edwards' conclusions should be treated with caution, for the statistical basis of his results is too narrow to bear the weight placed upon them.

<sup>185</sup> C.R., fol. 105-v.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid., fols 105v.-7v. The background of the patrons and the clerks instituted is discussed in Edwards, op. cit., pp. 54-70.

<sup>187</sup> C.R., fols 129v.-30v.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., fols 130v.-2; cf. Edwards, op. cit., pp. 126-45.

at Norwich in 1550 is not recorded, but each of the eleven institutions was made at Lambeth.<sup>189</sup> At Lincoln in 1551, the see fell vacant through the death of Henry Holbeach. Morton's Register shows that during the vacancy of 1494-5, the keeper of the spirituality exercised powers of institution, but collations were expressly reserved to the archbishop.<sup>190</sup> The keeper exercised this power even though it was not expressed in the composition. The commission from Thomas Cranmer to John Pope as official sede vacante explicitly reserves collations pleno iure sive devoluto to the archbishop.<sup>191</sup> In practice, however, the archbishop reserved both institutions and collations for himself.<sup>192</sup> Clearly, both in sees governed by composition and in those free of such arrangements, the patterns of administration might vary from diocese to diocese.

During the vacancy in the see of Norwich in 1550, the archbishop used his authority to settle a case of disputed presentation to the church of Roydon. The episcopal registry at Lambeth granted a commission to Thomas Falk to hear the case. Thomas Sherman, asserting his claim to patronage, presented Andrew Dunche to the vacant church. In like manner, William Kettilbourgh presented John Tuddenham. Falk was therefore commissioned to try the truth of the case. On 25 February, Falk sat judicially to hear the case in Roydon

<sup>189</sup> C.R., fols 109v.-15. Cf. Edwards, op. cit., pp. 84-100.

<sup>190</sup> Churchill, Administration, I, p. 178.

<sup>191</sup> C.R., fols 121v.-2.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., fols 122-7v. Cf. Edwards, op. cit., pp. 101-25. Cf. also D.M. Williamson, 'Sede Vacante Records of the Diocese of Lincoln' in Bulletin of the Society of Local Archivists, 12 (October, 1953), p. 18.

parish church. Sherman and Dunche did not appear and were pronounced contumacious. Those questioned said that the parish church of Roydon was vacant through the death of Henry Sturges, who died at Newmarket on 19 August 1549. The present patron was Kettilbrough by reason of the right and title of Elizabeth Spilman, who was the daughter of Eleanor, the second daughter of Ralph Radcliffe. Furthermore, they claimed that John Tuddenham was a right honest man whereas they did not know Andrew Dunche at all. On 5 March 1550, the process was presented to William Cooke, the archbishop's chancellor, in St Paul's cathedral. Cooke warned all the parties to appear before him on the following day at his home to hear his decision.<sup>193</sup> No further acta are recorded within the archiepiscopal Register. It is clear, nonetheless, that Tuddenham was instituted to the benefice. He first renounced papal supremacy according to statute.<sup>194</sup> Clearly, the archbishop used his authority to solve the dispute efficiently. Tuddenham's institution took place at Lambeth on 21 March 1550. The certificate to the archbishop from the dean and chapter intimating that the see was vacant is dated 31 January.<sup>195</sup> If Sturges did indeed die in August 1549, the archbishop's commissaries ended the dispute in just seven weeks.

The exercise of metropolitan jurisdiction in the administration of vacant sees and the political consequences

---

<sup>193</sup> C.R., fols 110-14v.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., fol. 114v.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid., fol. 107v.

of his metropolitical visitation both find measured expression within the archbishop's Register. The records of administration sede vacante are incomplete, but it is clear that there are important parallels between such documents and sede vacante records to be found in the Registers of mediaeval archbishops. It is true, however, that the changes ushered in by the Reformation Settlement are of paramount importance. Through their protests against the archbishop's metropolitical visitation, the bishops did not protest against the power of the King as supreme head. Rather, they protested in their various ways against any concept that the archbishop's power might stem from his papal bulls of provision. Behind the protests of Longland and Nykke lay the motive of the government in the creation of the Vice-Gerency. In his administration of the dioceses of his province sede vacante, Thomas Cranmer also made explicit the new bond between Church and State. In the commission of 1539 drawn up for the administration of the diocese of London sede vacante, the archbishop gave eloquent testimony to the fact that from henceforth his sede vacante jurisdiction was to be exercised by the authority of the King as supreme head of the English church.

## PART FOUR

'God's holy will': Thomas Cranmer and the Reformatio Legum  
Ecclesiasticarum

We would be sons, and heirs also, but we  
tremble at the rod. Do pray stir us up, and  
our nobility too, by the Spirit...to a regard  
for discipline...<sup>1</sup>

When Richard Cox wrote to Heinrich Bullinger from Windsor  
in October 1552, he expressed the pious hope that the Roman  
system of canon law would be abolished in favour of a reformed  
English code. Cox was mistaken in his hopes. The Canons  
of 1603/4 were the only attempt by the sixteenth and  
seventeenth century church in England to grapple with such  
a problem.<sup>2</sup>

The Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum which was  
drawn up by Cranmer<sup>3</sup> was never formally adopted by the English  
church. The archbishop had been empowered to proceed in  
the cause of reform since 1544.<sup>4</sup> In January 1546, Cranmer

---

<sup>1</sup> Original Letters relative to the English Reformation,  
written during the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI  
and Queen Mary: chiefly from the archives of Zurich, edited  
in 2 vols by H. Robinson for The Parker Society (Cambridge,  
1846-7), I, p. 123. For the quotation at the beginning of  
the chapter, cf. Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer,  
archbishop of Canterbury, martyr. 1556, relative to the  
sacrament of the Lord's Supper [henceforth cited as P.S.,  
Cranmer I], ed. for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox (Cambridge,  
1844), p. 377.

<sup>2</sup> Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical 1604, ed. by  
J.V. Bullard (London, 1934).

<sup>3</sup> The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws as attempted in  
the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen  
Elizabeth [henceforth cited as R.L.E.], a new edition by  
E. Cardwell (Oxford, 1850).

<sup>4</sup> Stat. Realm, III, p. 976.

wrote to the King that he would send the names of the commissioners 'as your highness in times passed appointed to make laws ecclesiastical for your grace's realm...and the book which they made'.<sup>5</sup> Professor Spalding has shown that Thomas Cranmer presented a copy of his legal code to parliament in March 1553. The duke of Northumberland openly opposed it:

...les Evesques avoient ung volume prest et composé par forme de droit canon; mais il n'a point esté receu, et estant ledit volume présenté aux Estats par l'Evesque de Cantorbery, Duc de Noorthumberlant[sic] que riens ne sen feroit...<sup>6</sup>

Northumberland pointed out that agitators had recently dwelt on the incorporation of church property and lands and on the dividing up of bishoprics, proclaiming that this was tantamount to heresy. The bishops should not let the like occur again. Cranmer was humbled into submission. As Professor Dickens has suggested, Northumberland's view is probably reflected in a passage in Edward VI's Journals.

---

<sup>5</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 415.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. J. Gairdner, Lollardy and the Reformation in England, 4 vols (London, 1908-13), III, pp. 400-1. An English translation of the despatch appears in ibid., pp. 363-4. Cf. also J.C. Spalding, 'The Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum of 1552 and the Furthering of Discipline in England' in Church History, vol. 39 (1970), pp. 166-7. No trace of the debate survives in the parliamentary Journals. Cf. Journals of the House of Lords, vol. I-(London, 1846-), I, pp. 430-44; cf. also Journals of the House of Commons, vol. I-(London, 1803-), I, pp. 24-6. The imperial ambassador, however, noted the debate. Cf. G.S.P., XI, p. 33.

The reform of the canons could not be entrusted to bishops, for they were either papists or ignorant, aged or wicked.<sup>7</sup>

Northumberland was not alone in refusing to allow the church to strengthen its position by the reform of its administrative and judicial systems. Professor Spalding has shown that in November 1549, Cranmer and others submitted a bill which would have facilitated the church's prosecution of immorality. Early in 1550, this bill was rejected in favour of one originating in the Commons by which canon law was to be reformed. The latter act was passed in spite of resistance from the bishops. The reform of canon law had been mooted for twenty years since the Submission of the Clergy in 1532. In suggesting such a reform, the Commons were clearly seeking to weaken the position of the prelates.<sup>8</sup> The laity were certainly opposed to any reform of canon law at the hands of ecclesiastics. Secular lawyers did not wish to compete against ecclesiastical law. John Hales wrote a legal treatise in the 1540s in which he praised common law over canon and civil law.<sup>9</sup> He maintained that the highest gift a Prince might receive would be ten such justices as the lord chancellor.<sup>10</sup> Civil lawyers, too, had

<sup>7</sup> A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (London, 1964), p. 250.

<sup>8</sup> Spalding, art. cit., pp. 162-3. For a general history of the attempts to reform canon law during the reign of Edward VI, cf. ibid., pp. 162-7. Cf. also L. Dibdin, English Church Law and Divorce (London, 1912), pp. 3-18. For the text of the Submission, cf. Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 176-8.

<sup>9</sup> B.L., Harleian MS. 4990, fols 1-48v.; L.P., XVII, Appendix 1.

<sup>10</sup> B.L., Harleian MS. 4990, fol. 44v.



profited from the eclipse of the canonists. Following Henry VIII's act in abolishing the study of canon law in the universities, the law administered in church courts was increasingly influenced by Roman civil law. Civil lawyers took over work in church courts.<sup>11</sup>

The existing text of the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum is a formidable testament to the archbishop's achievement in formulating a code of Christian discipline. When John Foxe printed a copy of the book in 1571, he used two manuscript copies. One was from the collections of Thomas Cranmer. The second belonged to archbishop Matthew Parker.<sup>12</sup> Only the former survives.<sup>13</sup> The order of titles in Cranmer's manuscript differs from that of the printed edition of 1571. In Cranmer's manuscript, for example, the section De Iuramentis et perjuriis stands at the beginning of the code,<sup>14</sup> whilst in the printed edition it is placed later in the text.<sup>15</sup> Cardwell noted that several sections in the printed code are lacking in Cranmer's extant manuscript. These sections comprise De Renunciacione, De permutatione

<sup>11</sup> Cf. R.A. Marchant, The Church under the Law (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 3-4.

<sup>12</sup> R.L.E., p. iv.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. B.L., Harleian MS. 426, fols 1-267v. Foxe certainly used Parker's manuscript, for an index in Cranmer's text which is in the hand of John Foxe shows the order of titles in Parker's manuscript. Cf. ibid., fol. 2.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., fols 26-9.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. R.L.E., pp. 216-21. Cardwell took as the standard for his edition the text of 1571. Cf. ibid., pp. xiv-xv. Cf. also Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, edited by J. Foxe (London, 1571); a copy exists at U.L.C. Q\*. 5.64.

profited from the eclipse of the canonists. Following Henry VIII's act in abolishing the study of canon law in the universities, the law administered in church courts was increasingly influenced by Roman civil law. Civil lawyers took over work in church courts.<sup>11</sup>

The existing text of the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum is a formidable testament to the archbishop's achievement in formulating a code of Christian discipline. When John Foxe printed a copy of the book in 1571, he used two manuscript copies. One was from the collections of Thomas Cranmer. The second belonged to archbishop Matthew Parker.<sup>12</sup> Only the former survives.<sup>13</sup> The order of titles in Cranmer's manuscript differs from that of the printed edition of 1571. In Cranmer's manuscript, for example, the section De Iuramentis et perjuriis stands at the beginning of the code,<sup>14</sup> whilst in the printed edition it is placed later in the text.<sup>15</sup> Cardwell noted that several sections in the printed code are lacking in Cranmer's extant manuscript. These sections comprise De Renunciacione, De permutatione

<sup>11</sup> Cf. R.A. Marchant, The Church under the Law (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 3-4.

<sup>12</sup> R.L.E., p. iv.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. B.L., Harleian MS. 426, fols 1-267v. Foxe certainly used Parker's manuscript, for an index in Cranmer's text which is in the hand of John Foxe shows the order of titles in Parker's manuscript. Cf. ibid., fol. 2.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., fols 26-9.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. R.L.E., pp. 216-21. Cardwell took as the standard for his edition the text of 1571. Cf. ibid., pp. xiv-xv. Cf. also Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, edited by J. Foxe (London, 1571); a copy exists at U.L.C. Q\*. 5.64.

beneficiorum, De purgatione, De poenis ecclesiasticis,  
De suspensione, De fructuum deductione, De deprivatione  
 and De excommunicatione [except the Formula reconciliationis].<sup>16</sup>  
 Cranmer's manuscript was carefully studied by the archbishop  
 himself. It contains additions in the hands of Cranmer,  
 Peter Martyr and Haddon.<sup>17</sup> The final code contained provisions  
 for the administrative and judicial systems of the English  
 church. It began with sections on the reformed faith,  
 which are entitled De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica<sup>18</sup>  
 and De Heresibus.<sup>19</sup> This was followed by an important  
 section De Iudiciis contra hereses.<sup>20</sup> The crucial  
 administrative sections comprised De Concionatoribus,<sup>21</sup>  
De admittendis ad ecclesiastica beneficia,<sup>22</sup> De divinatorum  
officiorum celebratione,<sup>23</sup> De Ecclesia et Ministris eius  
illorumque officiis,<sup>24</sup> and De Visitationibus.<sup>25</sup> The remaining  
 titles dealt with strictly legal and curial matters.

Thomas Cranmer's endeavour to reform ecclesiastical  
 law was not the only attempt to remove abuses contained

<sup>16</sup> R.L.E., p. xv.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. vi.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., fols 8-19.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., fols 30-3.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., fols 63-8v.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., fols 135v.-7v. The text of the code which was  
 printed by Cardwell is a reliable guide to the contents  
 of the existing manuscript in The British Library. In the  
 title De Ecclesia et Ministris eius. illorumque officiis,  
 the fourth chapter entitled De Presbyteris contains an addition  
 not found in Cardwell's edition: 'Nullus aut rasuram, aut  
tonsuram papisticam in vertice gerat'. Cardwell properly  
 noted that the sentence occurs only in Cranmer's manuscript.  
 Cf. B.L., Harleian MS. 426, fol. 84v. and R.L.E., pp. 100 and  
 334.

<sup>18</sup> B.L., Harleian MS. 426, fols 3-7v.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., fols 19-23.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., fols 53-60v.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., fols 82-91.

within the papal code. Thomas Cromwell himself superintended such a revision in the 1530s. The product of that work has recently been discovered.<sup>26</sup> Dr Logan has dated the compilation to the year 1535.<sup>27</sup> Clearly, the manuscript was not simply a draft for Cranmer's later code. Whilst the canons were both administrative and judicial, the titles differ from those recorded in the Edwardine compilation. The collection begins with a section De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica,<sup>28</sup> and there are also sections entitled De electionibus,<sup>29</sup> De Institutionibus,<sup>30</sup> De Testamentis,<sup>31</sup> and De Sponsa et matrimoniis.<sup>32</sup> In some ways, the compilation was conservative since the code envisaged the existence of religious orders. There were provisions for the payment of tithe by the religious.<sup>33</sup> The code, however, was specifically designed to replace papal law. In the section De Testamentis, the separate chapters carefully regulated provisions for probate jurisdiction. All cases not covered by the rules were to be judged by civil law as long as the latter was not contrary to statute.<sup>34</sup> The code is phrased throughout in

<sup>26</sup> Cf. F.D. Logan, 'The Henrician Canons' in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. XLVII(1974), pp. 99-103. The text comprises B.L. Add. MS. 48040, fols 13-102v. It was formerly Yelverton MS. 45. Cf. Logan, art. cit., p. 101 n. 4. For a general discussion of the Yelverton MSS, cf. B. Schofield, 'The Yelverton Manuscripts' in British Museum Quarterly, vol. XIX(1954), pp. 3-9.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Logan, art. cit., pp. 102-3.

<sup>28</sup> B.L., Add. MS. 48040, fols 16v.-20v.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., fols 47v.-54v.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., fols 64-9.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., fols 92v.-8.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., fols 69v.-76v.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., fol. 82-v.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., fols 97v.-8.

the first person plural. Royal supremacy was clearly designed to replace papal supremacy. The section De Testamentis provides useful illustration of the point:

Insinuationes et approbationes testamentorum et bonorum decedentium ab intestato administrationis commissionem quorumcumque ad ordinarium loci pertinere volumus, nisi ad alios per compositionem, privilegium aut legitime prescriptam consuetudinem pertinere dinoscitur; salva semper prerogativa archiepiscoporum haecenus usitata, cui per premissa nolumus in aliquo derogari.<sup>35</sup>

Testamentary jurisdiction was to belong to the bishops by the King's command. Even the archbishops' right to claim bona notabilia in diversis diocesis was to rest on the King's grant.<sup>36</sup>

Thomas Cranmer's Reformatio Legum was intended to stand with The Book of Common Prayer and the Articles of Religion as the basis upon which the reformed faith and practice of the church of England were to stand.<sup>37</sup> When Martin Luther burned the papal bull Exsurge Domine, he also consigned to the flames the books of Roman canon law.<sup>38</sup> Cranmer's attempts to revise the papal code form an interesting comment on his attitude to reform. By the

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., fol. 92v.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 380-423 and II, pp. 171-85. Cf. also R.E. Rhodes, Ecclesiastical Administration in Medieval England: The Anglo-Saxons to the Reformation (Notre Dame, 1977), p. 109.

<sup>37</sup> For the authoritative text of The Book of Common Prayer of 1552, cf. P.S., Liturgien, pp. 187-355. For the Articles of Religion, cf. ibid., pp. 526-37.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. R.H. Bainton, Here I stand (London, 1951), pp. 165-6.

early 1550s, the archbishop was concerned to emphasise that discipline was of importance. In the Articles of Religion, Cranmer defined the Church in terms of Word and Sacrament. It was the place where 'the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance'.<sup>39</sup> It was Martin Bucer who made discipline the third mark of the Church:

Partes vero huius ministerii, Doctrina Christi, Sacramentorum eius dispensatio, et disciplinae eius administratio.<sup>40</sup>

Although Calvin attached great importance to the concept of discipline, he refrained from making it one of the marks of the true Church.<sup>41</sup> In the Reformatio Legum, ecclesiastical visitors are to enquire on visitation

An sacrae Scripturae diligenter et sincere pertractentur; an apta sit et recta sacramentorum administratio; deinde disciplina qualis ecclesiarum sit, et quantum habeat roboris...<sup>42</sup>

Cranmer certainly read Calvin's Institutes of 1536.<sup>43</sup>

Manuscript evidence for the evolution of the archbishop's thought is lacking, but it is possible that Cranmer approached the ideas of Calvin with some sympathy. Both men came to

<sup>39</sup>Cf. P.S., Liturgies, p. 531.

<sup>40</sup>M. Bucer, Scripta Anglicana (Basel, 1577), p. 36. The phrase appears in his work De Regno Christi.

<sup>41</sup>F. Wendel, Calvin: the origins and development of his religious thought, translated into English by P. Mairet (London, 1963), p. 301 and n. 22. The idea occurs in the Ecclesiastical Ordinances of 1541. Cf. ibid., p. 75.

<sup>42</sup>R.L.E., p. 132.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fols 192-4.

early 1550s, the archbishop was concerned to emphasise that discipline was of importance. In the Articles of Religion, Cranmer defined the Church in terms of Word and Sacrament. It was the place where 'the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance'.<sup>39</sup> It was Martin Bucer who made discipline the third mark of the Church:

Partes vero huius ministerii. Doctrina Christi.  
Sacramentorum eius dispensatio, et disciplinae  
eius administratio.<sup>40</sup>

Although Calvin attached great importance to the concept of discipline, he refrained from making it one of the marks of the true Church.<sup>41</sup> In the Reformatio Legum, ecclesiastical visitors are to enquire on visitation

An sacrae Scripturae diligenter et sincere  
pertractentur: an apta sit et recta  
sacramentorum administratio: deinde disciplina  
qualis ecclesiarum sit, et quantum habeat  
roboris...<sup>42</sup>

Cranmer certainly read Calvin's Institutes of 1536.<sup>43</sup>

Manuscript evidence for the evolution of the archbishop's thought is lacking, but it is possible that Cranmer approached the ideas of Calvin with some sympathy. Both men came to

<sup>39</sup>Cf. P.S., Liturgies, p. 531.

<sup>40</sup>M. Bucer, Scripta Anglicana (Basel, 1577), p. 36. The phrase appears in his work De Regno Christi.

<sup>41</sup>F. Wendel, Calvin: the origins and development of his religious thought, translated into English by P. Mairet (London, 1963), p. 301 and n. 22. The idea occurs in the Ecclesiastical Ordinances of 1541. Cf. ibid., p. 75.

<sup>42</sup>R.L.E., p. 132.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fols 192-4.



hold the concept of discipline in high regard, whilst refraining from making it a 'nota Ecclesiae'.

No exposition of Cranmer's concept of discipline survives in the existing writings of the archbishop. In his theology, however, he distinguished between a twofold doctrine of the Church. Again, little survives among the archbishop's writings to illustrate his views.<sup>44</sup> In the Articles of Religion, Cranmer maintained that 'The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men'.<sup>45</sup> In the Reformatio Legum, he contrasted his own view with that of the Church of Rome:

illorum etiam intolerabilis est error, qui  
totius Christiani orbis universam Ecclesiam  
solius episcopi Romani principatu contineri  
volunt.<sup>46</sup>

The Church was not a matter of external hierarchy, but concerned simply the faithful believers:

Nos enim eam que cerni potest Ecclesiam sic  
definimus, ut omnium coetus sit fidelium  
hominum, in quo sacra Scriptura sincere docetur,  
et sacramenta...juxta Christi praescriptum  
administrantur.<sup>47</sup>

Membership of the Christian community was gained through the sacrament of baptism.<sup>48</sup> This Church was the 'open

<sup>44</sup>The section De Ecclesia in the archbishop's sacramental Commonplace Books contains one single extract. Cf. B.L., MS. Royal 7B XII, fol. 39.

<sup>45</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 531.

<sup>46</sup>R.L.E., pp. 20-1.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>P.S., Liturgies, pp. 533-4.



known church'.<sup>49</sup> Cranmer contrasted the visible Church with the Church that is invisible:

this holy church is so unknown to the world,  
that no man can discern it, but God alone, who  
only searcheth the hearts of all men, and  
knoweth his true children...<sup>50</sup>

Before creation, God decided whom He would save.<sup>51</sup> It stood within the power of men, however, to know only the visible Church. The open Church had for the last five hundred years been defiled by papists.<sup>52</sup> It was a measure of Cranmer's devotion to his concept of the visible Church that he formulated his reform of ecclesiastical law.

Two principles support the archbishop's conviction that the Church might exercise such discipline. The Church defined doctrine and defended it against adversaries. That body, however, was captive to the Word. The Articles of Religion emphasised that it was not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that was contrary to 'God's word written'. It might not expound one place of Holy Scripture so that it was contrary to another. It might not enforce anything as an article of faith which was not contained in Holy Scripture.<sup>53</sup> In this way, the Church was 'a register or

<sup>49</sup>P.S., Cranmer I, p. 377.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid.

<sup>51</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 530.

<sup>52</sup>P.S., Cranmer I, p. 378.

<sup>53</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 531.

treasury to keep the books of God's holy will and testament'.<sup>54</sup>

The second pillar of Cranmer's understanding rested upon the conviction that the power to bind and loose rested with the Church by divine commission. Alluding to Matthew 18<sup>18</sup>, the Formula reconciliationis excommunicatorum within the Reformatio Legum instructed the pastor to tell the excommunicant:

Ego coram hac ecclesia, cujus mihi administratio commissa est, te tuorum poena delictorum et excommunicationis exsolvo vinculis, per auctoritatem Dei potestatis, Jesu Christi, et Spiritus sancti, consentientibus hujus ecclesiae praesentibus membris, et etiam ordinario suffragante...<sup>55</sup>

In the name of the church, the priest absolved the penitent of his sins by virtue of authority committed to him by God.

In his sacramental Commonplaces, which probably date from the early 1540s, the archbishop investigated the question.<sup>56</sup>

With Chrysostom, he agreed that no-one was to reject ecclesiastical discipline:

Non enim hom[o] est, qui ligat, sed Christus, qui nobis hanc potestatem dedit.<sup>57</sup>

Cranmer stressed that such a power might be delegated only by the King. The King held both swords, spiritual as well as temporal:

Rex tam in archiepiscopos, episcopos, clericos, et alios ministros, quam in laicos infra sua

<sup>54</sup>P.S., Cranmer I, p. 377.

<sup>55</sup>R.L.E., p. 186.

<sup>56</sup>B.L., MS. Royal 7B XII, fols 70-2.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., fol 71.

regna et dominia plenissimam jurisdictionem  
tam civilem quam ecclesiasticam, habet et  
exercere potest, cum omnis jurisdictio et  
ecclesiastica et secularis ab eo tanquam ex  
uno et eodem fonte derivatur.<sup>58</sup>

In his Answers to Questions of 1540,<sup>59</sup> Cranmer was asked whether only priests and bishops might possess the power of excommunication. He answered that Holy Scripture neither advocated nor attempted to forbid such a practice,

but where the laws of any region giveth him authority to excommunicate, there they ought to use the same...and where the laws of the region forbiddeth them, there they have none authority at all...<sup>60</sup>

If the archbishop was clear in the 1550s that discipline was to be regarded as important, he embraced no new legalism. Spiritualists and Anabaptists objected to external regulations on two grounds. In a collection of passages in his sacramental Commonplace Books, the archbishop carefully examined their views:

Non addetis ad verbum quod loquor vobis nec  
auferetis ex eo...Iusto non est lex posita.<sup>61</sup>

Cranmer rejected such Scriptural exegesis. The Articles of Religion maintained that 'HOLY Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation'. Such doctrines were to be taken

<sup>58</sup> R.L.E., p. 200.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 115 n. 1.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>61</sup> B.L., MS. Royal 7B XII, fol. 319. The Scriptural texts are Revelation 22 vv 18-19 and I Timothy 1 v. 9.

as articles of faith 'requisite to the necessity of Salvation'.<sup>62</sup>

Yet, there were also matters not contained in Scripture which may

be sometime received of the faithful, as godly,  
and profitable for an order, and comeliness...<sup>63</sup>

In his concept of Christian liberty, moreover, the archbishop also rejected Anabaptist notions of that concept. He noted:

Libertas evangelica, sicut non excludit  
potestatem et obedienciam superioris, ita  
nec eius statuta, sed libertas illa opponitur  
servituti legis mosaicae et servituti peccati.  
Ideo est solum libertas in Spiritu quia non  
servit peccatis et quia ipsa libertas promovet  
bonum, non excludit constitutiones et Ecclesiae  
precepta quae similiter promovent bonum. Et  
mox. Est igitur Christiana seu evangelica  
libertas non aliud quam (ut Paulo placet)  
redemptio sive absolutio a servitute<sup>64</sup> legis  
et peccati per Jesum Christum facta; qua  
addicti Deo et iusticiae filiorum adoptionem  
recipimus.<sup>65</sup>

Christian liberty did not mean freedom from external constraints.

Rather, it meant freedom from the law and from sin. Those

who receive the Spirit

non sunt sub lege Mosaica aut coerciva...  
[sed] lege directiva sicut Adam habuit in  
paradiso.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>62</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 527.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> peccati follows servitute and is erased in MS.

<sup>65</sup> B.L., MS. Royal 7B XII, fol. 319v.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid. The correction is editorial.

Thomas Cranmer's Register is primarily a record of his administrative, not his curial, jurisdiction. No discussion of the aims of such jurisdiction survives among the archbishop's existing papers. In terms of administration, however, Cranmer held that such jurisdiction was firmly based upon two precepts. One was to give honour to God. In a letter to Cromwell in 1535, Cranmer appealed to the Epistles of St Paul to the Corinthians to illustrate the concept:

I would that...the very christian conversation of the people might be the letters and seals of our offices, as the Corinthians were unto Paul, to whom he said: Litterae nostrae et signa apostolatus nostri vos estis.<sup>67</sup>

In the opening chapter of the Reformatio Legum, moreover, Cranmer stated that whosoever offended against the teachings of the Christian religion alienated himself from God because of his impiety.<sup>68</sup> The second aim of such administrative jurisdiction was pastoral care. In his Commonplaces from the Roman canon law, which date from the mid 1530s, the archbishop had already come to question notions of administration which were legalistic:

Cum episcopus in sua tota dioecesi iurisdictionem ordinariam noscatur habere dubium non existit quin...possit...quae ad

<sup>67</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 305.

<sup>68</sup>R.L.E., p. 1.

ipsius spectant officium, libere exercere.<sup>69</sup>

In his Annotations to the Corrections of Henry VIII to the Institution of a Christian Man,<sup>70</sup> Cranmer appealed to St Paul in commending the teaching of the Institution that those possessing powers of jurisdiction should 'provide and care' for those in their charge:

It may right well appear that St Paul affirmeth this point, specially to be required in all such as have governance over other, in these words that he saith, Rom. xli. Qui praeest in sollicitudine praesit.<sup>71</sup>

It was the task of the Reformatio Legum to promote such ideas.

Thomas Cranmer's code Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, a title which Foxe appended to the collection with no apparent authority,<sup>72</sup> opens with a statement concerning De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica.<sup>73</sup> The second chapter dealt with the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>74</sup> The doctrine of justification by faith alone is stated with some simplicity:

Christus...vere passus est..nobisque per suum sanguinem reconciliavit Patrem, sese hostiam offerens illi, non solum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus peccatis

<sup>69</sup> Strype, Cranmer, III A & A, pp. 829-30: Cum Episcopus; spectant...exercere underlined in MS.

<sup>70</sup> The date of the Annotations is unclear, but they probably date from the early 1540s. Cf. P.S., Cranmer II, p. 83 n. 2.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 104. Cf. Romans 12<sup>7a</sup>.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Logan, art. cit., p. 102.

<sup>73</sup> R.L.E., pp. 1-7.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., pp. 1-2.



quae homines propria voluntate adjecerunt.<sup>75</sup>

The creeds and books of Holy Scripture are carefully itemized.<sup>76</sup> The ninth chapter insisted that 'omnia credenda ex canonicis haberi Scripturis'.<sup>77</sup> Anything not found there was not to be held as an article of faith. The eleventh chapter laid down basic rules for Scriptural exegesis. No text might be so expounded so as to contradict another.<sup>78</sup> Should there be any misunderstanding when Holy Scripture was being read, the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament were to be consulted.<sup>79</sup>

This section was followed by one entitled De Haeresibus.<sup>80</sup> Heretics were defined as those who 'communis nostrae fidei decretum aliquod secus accipiunt, quam sacra Scriptura determinatum est'.<sup>81</sup> Anabaptists were singled out for comment. Such heretics alleged that the Old Testament had been abrogated.<sup>82</sup> In the Articles of Religion, Cranmer maintained: 'The Old Testament is not to be put away, as though it were contrary to the new; but to be kept still'.<sup>83</sup> Anabaptists were also rebuked for their refusal to offer

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., pp. 3-4.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., pp. 8-22.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>83</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 527.

obedience to secular magistrates. Cranmer showed that magistrates ruled at the behest of the Holy Spirit:

Imo vero Spiritus sanctus statuit principes et magistratus esse Dei ministros, ut benefactis favorem suum impartiant, et maleficia suppliciis constringant.<sup>84</sup>

They were also condemned for holding property in common,<sup>85</sup> and for rejecting the practice of infant baptism.<sup>86</sup>

It was not Anabaptists alone who were attacked for their beliefs. Adherents of the Roman Church were likewise singled out for special comment. The Articles of Religion insisted that the 'sacrifices of masses' are 'forged fables, and dangerous deceits'.<sup>87</sup> The doctrine of purgatory was 'grounded upon no warrant of scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God'.<sup>88</sup> Such ideas were also condemned in the archbishop's Reformatio Legum. Basing his position upon the doctrine justificatio sola fide, he condemned those who dismissed that concept in favour of the sacrifices of masses:

quibus perpurgari possint, et ad hanc rem missas exhibent in quibus sacrificium Deo Patri credunt oblatum esse...<sup>89</sup>

The doctrine of transubstantiation was vigorously denied since it was 'alienum a sacris litteris'.<sup>90</sup> Since Christ had ascended into heaven following his crucifixion, it was

<sup>84</sup> R.L.E., p. 15.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., pp. 17-18.

<sup>87</sup> P.S., Liturgies, pp. 534-5.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., p. 532.

<sup>89</sup> R.L.E., pp. 12-13.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., p. 19.



impossible that Christ could be corporally present in the elements:

Obrepsit etiam in eucharistia periculosissimus error eorum qui docent...panem converti vel (ut ipsi loquuntur) transubstantiari in Christi corpus, et itidem vinum in sanguinem.<sup>91</sup>

The eucharist was not to be held in greater veneration than baptism and the Word of God. The true nature of the eucharistic presence was to be perceived by faith. Cranmer spoke of 'Christi praesentia quae fide percipitur'.<sup>92</sup> As Dr P.N. Brooks has shown, Thomas Cranmer's mature eucharistic doctrine is to be denoted as a doctrine of the 'True' presence in which the merits of Christ's passion are received spiritually by all those who believe.<sup>93</sup> In essence, Cranmer's doctrine of the eucharist was carefully linked to his concept of justification by faith alone. Further heresies were rejected in the Reformatio Legum. In the section De Haeresibus, he emphasised that the doctrine of free will ran contrary to Holy Scripture. It was heretical to maintain that man might live 'sine alia speciali Christi gratia'. Anabaptists were also mistaken in their view of Original Sin. Like the Pelegians, they believed that the effects of Adam's sin remained with Adam and were not inherited by others.<sup>94</sup> The Articles of Religion declared

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. P.N. Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist (London, 1965), pp. 72-111.

<sup>94</sup> R.L.E., p. 11.

'Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ...is a most certain and wholesome doctrine...'.<sup>95</sup> Within the Reformatio Legum, Cranmer mentioned only those heresies which plagued the Church of his day.<sup>96</sup> The description of the catholic faith, however, and of the heresies to be avoided was a measured summary of the theological position which he wished the church of England to adopt.

Following the definition of Christian doctrine, the pattern of discipline was carefully enunciated. Within the section De divinis Officiis, there are sixteen chapters.<sup>97</sup> The collection of chapters reveals that the archbishop carefully adapted mediaeval patterns of administration to implement reformed liturgies. The aim of liturgical services was twofold:

...non solum a se Deum laudari oportere,  
sed alios etiam hortatu et exemplo et  
observatione illorum ad eundem cultum  
adducendos esse.<sup>98</sup>

The central service common to all churches was to be the Lord's Supper, in which all parishoners were to participate.<sup>99</sup> Communion under both kinds by the whole congregation had been introduced by statute in 1547.<sup>100</sup> Such liturgy had contained English prayers from 1548.<sup>101</sup> Cranmer's

<sup>95</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 528.

<sup>96</sup> R.L.E., p. 22.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., pp. 88-96.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., p. 89. For a complete discussion of the reformed Books of Common Prayer, cf. F.E. Brightman, The English Rite, 2nd rev. ed., 2 vols (Farnborough, 1970).

<sup>99</sup> R.L.E., p. 91.

<sup>100</sup> Stat. Realm. IV, 1, pp. 2-3.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. P.S., Liturgies, pp. 1-8.

desire for a vernacular liturgy was based on firm Scriptural foundations. In 1549, the commons in Devon and Cornwall rioted against the introduction of The Book of Common Prayer. One of their demands required the re-instatement of the Mass in Latin. Recalling the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, Cranmer pointed out that the apostle required that 'whosoever shall speak to the people in the church...must speak such language as the people may understand'.<sup>102</sup> Private chapels were not allowed:

Nolumus in sacellis, nisi singularis quaedam  
necessitas urserit, administrari sacramenta,  
nec reliquam in illis adhiberi sacrorum  
officiorum rationem; quoniam ita futurum  
esset, ut proprias homines ecclesias  
destituerent...<sup>103</sup>

Such a view was directly dependent upon Cranmer's concept of the visible Church. Special rules were to apply to the families of the nobility. Men engaged on public business might have private chapels provided that nothing prejudicial was done to the local parish church.<sup>104</sup> Such a stipulation was not an innovation. William Melton's York Register records that on 7 May 1318 a licence was issued to William de Baxby for the celebration of services in the oratory of his manor of Baxby provided that nothing prejudicial be done to the parish church of Coxwold.<sup>105</sup> Nine similar

<sup>102</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 169-70.

<sup>103</sup> R.L.E., p. 94.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., p. 95.

<sup>105</sup> The Register of William Melton Archbishop of York, 1317-1340, II, ed. by D. Robinson (Canterbury and York Society, 71, 1978), pp. 11-12.

licences are recorded in Thomas Cranmer's Register.<sup>106</sup>

On 23 February 1543, Thomas Saunder of Charlewoode in the deanery of Croydon was granted a licence for a private oratory provided that the rector of the local parish church could agree and that nothing prejudicial be done to the tithes and offerings of the church.<sup>107</sup>

The archbishop's concern to further his concept of the Word was the corner-stone of his doctrine of ministry. In his Answers to the Questions of 1540, Cranmer gave testimony concerning his views. Acknowledging that the Latin sacramentum was equivalent to the Greek mysterium, he said that he knew 'no cause why this word "sacrament" should be attributed to the seven only'.<sup>108</sup> In his sacramental Commonplace Books, Cranmer set out the theological justification for his views. In the Answers, he said that he found 'nothing in the scripture' to prove that ordination was a sacrament.<sup>109</sup> In the sacramental Commonplaces, the archbishop maintained with Bede that the Incarnation had ushered in a new era in the history of mankind. Making explicit reference to the concept of the priesthood of all believers, the archbishop could assert:

Non autem de solis episcopis et presbiteris dictum est, qui proprie vocantur in Ecclesia sacerdotes, sed sicut omnes Christi dicimur propter mysticum chrisma, sic omnes sacerdotes...<sup>110</sup>

<sup>106</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fols 15-v., 16v., 17, 21v.-2, 39, 40 and 47v.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., fol. 47v.

<sup>108</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 115.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., p. 116.

<sup>110</sup> B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fol. 189v.

In his Answers of 1540, therefore, the archbishop was able to maintain that 'there is no more promise of God, that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office'.<sup>111</sup>

Such a view held important implications for his doctrine of ministry. He was concerned to investigate Scriptural claims for the pattern of ministry within the Church. In his tract That a Christian Assembly or Congregation has the right and power to judge, Martin Luther contrasted a world containing no Christian pastors with communities where Christians did exist.<sup>112</sup> In his Answers, Cranmer made a similar distinction. In the time of the apostles, there were no Christian princes to govern the people. Consequently, the method of appointing ministers varied. The apostles might appoint them. Sometimes 'the people did choose such as they thought meet'.<sup>113</sup> With Ambrose, however, Cranmer maintained:

...postquam in omnibus locis Ecclesiae sunt constitutae, et officia ordinata, aliter composita res est, quam coeperat.<sup>114</sup>

The archbishop was clear that the Roman pattern of a sevenfold ministry was invalid since it could claim no support

<sup>111</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 116.

<sup>112</sup> Luther's Works [henceforth cited as L.W.], edited in 56 vols under the general editorship of J. Pelikan and H.T. Lehmann (Philadelphia, 1955-75), 39, p. 310.

<sup>113</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 116-17.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fols 186v.-7v.; 'postquam ...coeperat' underlined in MS.

in Holy Scripture. He made a careful note of passages in the first edition of John Calvin's Institutes on this subject.<sup>115</sup> Calvin's concern for Holy Scripture was paramount. There was always disagreement 'cum [homines] de rebus divinis sine Verbo Dei disceptant'.<sup>116</sup> Calvin rejected the minor orders because they were unknown to the primitive Church.<sup>117</sup> He maintained that such orders were thought up many years later. Concerning ministry within the Church, Holy Scripture

non alium agnoscit ecclesie ministerium, quam Verbi Dei precontione ad regendam ecclesiam vocatum, quem nunc episcopum, nunc presbiterum, interdum pastorem etiam appellat.<sup>118</sup>

It was surely such views which led Cranmer to claim in his Answers that 'The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion'.<sup>119</sup>

In the revised Ordinal of 1550, Cranmer was able to implement his reformed views concerning ministry. In the Preface, he maintained that from the time of the apostles, there had existed within the Church the orders of bishop, priest and deacon.<sup>120</sup> He did not say that these were the only orders ever instituted in Christ's Church. In the Ordinal, Cranmer ascribed the foundation of patterns of

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., fols 192-4.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., fol. 192v.; the correction is editorial.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., fol. 193v.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., fol. 194.

<sup>119</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 117.

<sup>120</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 161. The Ordinal of 1552 maintained the same point. Cf. ibid., p. 331.



ministry to God Himself,<sup>121</sup> to God through the Holy Spirit<sup>122</sup> and to Christ.<sup>123</sup> In the Reformatio Legum, the archbishop condemned Anabaptists who rejected all patterns of specialized ministry:

Similis est illorum amentia, qui institutionem ministrorum ab Ecclesia disjungunt, negantes in certis locis certos doctores, pastores atque ministros collocari debere...<sup>124</sup>

The archbishop's concept of ministry, however, did not run contrary to his belief in the priesthood of all believers, for the latter idea was harnessed to the former by a double doctrine of vocation. Such a conviction was widely held among the continental reformers. Professor Wendel, for example, has shown that Calvin advocated such a doctrine.<sup>125</sup> Cranmer maintained that each minister possessed an internal call. Such a call was essentially secret, unknown to the Church. In the consecration of a bishop, the congregation was to pray before the new bishop was admitted 'to the work whereunto we trust the Holy Ghost hath called him'.<sup>126</sup>

Such a vocation did not belong exclusively to the threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons. All those offering themselves as preachers were to be duly examined to see 'an illorum spiritus a Deo proficiscantur'.<sup>127</sup>

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., pp. 168 and 338.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., pp. 174, 183, 344 and 351.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., pp. 178, 185, 348 and 353.

<sup>124</sup> R.L.E., p. 16. The wording of the canon seems to be based on Ephesians 4, vv. 11-12.

<sup>125</sup> F. Wendel, Calvin, translated into English by P. Mairet, [Fontana Library] (London, 1965), p. 304.

<sup>126</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 351. Cf. ibid., pp. 339 and 345-6.

<sup>127</sup> R.L.E., p. 36.

There was also an external call, which was primarily a matter of due appointment and examination. In the Articles of Religion, the concept is defined in this way:

And those we ought to judge lawfully called, and sent, which be chosen, and called to this work by men, who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call, and to send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.<sup>128</sup>

Such a double doctrine of vocation formed an important part of the archbishop's thought. Martin Bucer's treatise De Ordinatione Legitima is rightly taken to be of some influence in the composition of the Anglican Ordinal.<sup>129</sup>

In Bucer's form of examination, great stress is laid upon the qualities of the ordinand and this has important parallels with Cranmer's own liturgy.<sup>130</sup> The significance of Bucer's rite, however, should not be over-estimated.

Bucer wished the ministers to found 'godly gatherings for discussion to establish a fuller knowledge of the doctrines of Christ'.<sup>131</sup> No such demand appears in Cranmer's Ordinal of 1552.<sup>132</sup>

Concerning the appointment of ministers, Martin Luther maintained that Holy Scripture gave 'an overwhelming power to the Christian congregation to preach, to permit

<sup>128</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 532.

<sup>129</sup>Recent research has shown that the date of the treatise is unclear; cf. Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer, ed. by E.C. Whitaker (Alcuin Club, Collections 55, 1974), pp. 4-6. Cf. also M. Bucer, Scripta Anglicana (Basel, 1577), pp. 238-59.

<sup>130</sup>Cf. Whitaker, op. cit., pp. 177-83. Cf. also P.S., Liturgies, pp. 159-86.

<sup>131</sup>Whitaker, op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>132</sup>P.S., Liturgies, pp. 329-55.



preaching, and to call'.<sup>133</sup> In the Preface to the Ordinal, Cranmer maintained that from the time of the apostles no-one had been able to exercise ministry as bishop, priest or deacon

except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities, as were requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereunto.<sup>134</sup>

By virtue of his membership of the priesthood of all believers and his external call, a clerk exercised his public ministry on behalf of the congregation. Alluding to Matthew 18<sup>18</sup>, the Formula reconciliationis excommunicatorum within the Reformatio Legum instructed the pastor to tell the excommunicant:

Ego coram hac ecclesia, cujus administratio mihi commissa est, te tuorum poena delictorum et excommunicationis exsolvo vinculis, per auctoritatem Dei potestatis, Jesu Christi, et Spiritus sancti, consentientibus hujus ecclesiae praesentibus membris, et etiam ordinario suffragante...<sup>135</sup>

In the name of the Church, the priest absolved the penitent of his sins by virtue of the authority committed to him by God. In the Articles of Religion, Cranmer maintained that bishops were entrusted with 'public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call, and send ministers into the

<sup>133</sup> L.W., 39, 311.

<sup>134</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 331.

<sup>135</sup> R.L.E., p. 186.

Lord's vineyard.<sup>136</sup> Appointment in the congregation was properly a ratification of God's own choice. A minister's internal call was of paramount importance. With Chrysostom, Cranmer agreed:

Videte quam illicitum est usurpare opus  
quod a Deo non est commissum. Quale facit  
peccatum laicus usurpans sibi opus clericale,  
tale facit peccatum et lector si usurpaverit  
opus diaconi, et diaconus si usurpaverit  
sibi opus presbiteri, et presbiter si  
appetierit episcopalem potestatem.<sup>137</sup>

The archbishop rejected the received Roman doctrine of orders. By virtue of their baptism, all men are priests. At different times and in different places, the form of ministry may vary. In the revised Ordinal, Cranmer retained a specialized form of ministry founded in the teachings of Holy Scripture. The threefold pattern of ministry was carefully linked to his concept of the priesthood of all believers by a double doctrine of vocation. Each minister experienced an internal call from God. The external call consisted in due examination and appointment. Since the congregation ratified the admission of a candidate to his office, each clerk performed his public ministry on behalf of the congregation.

In the Reformatio Legum, rules are set down for the scope of the service which each minister was to exercise

<sup>136</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 532.

<sup>137</sup>B.L., MS. Royal 7B XI, fol. 184-v.

in the congregation. Cranmer looked to Holy Scripture for the rules for such ministry. He also looked to tradition which did not run contrary to Holy Scripture. The archbishop's reforming insights come to the fore in the collection of canons entitled De Ecclesia et Ministris ejus, illorumque officiis.<sup>138</sup> The tenth chapter is entitled De episcoporum gradu ac dignitate in Ecclesia. Since ordination was no longer to be counted as a sacrament, the archbishop distinguished between the rank(gradus) and honour(dignitas) due to a bishop. From the mediaeval heritage of episcopacy, which Cranmer inherited, the archbishop saw that in terms of honour bishops held a principal place:

Episcopi, quoniam inter ceteros Ecclesiae ministros locum principem tenent, ideo sana doctrina, gravi autoritate, atque provido consilio debent inferiores ordines cleri, universumque populum Dei regere...<sup>139</sup>

Since bishops exercised their ministry in the name of the congregation, Cranmer insisted that they should not be masters but servants. They were to show themselves to be 'vere servos servorum Dei'.<sup>140</sup> They must know that ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction have been given to them for no other reason

nisi ut a suo ministerio et assiduitate homines quam plurimi Christo iungantur...<sup>141</sup>

In short, the archbishop carefully linked mediaeval concepts concerning episcopacy to his reformed spirituality.

<sup>138</sup> R.L.E., pp. 96-112.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., p. 103.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., p. 104.

Obedience was to be shown to bishops by all members of the church so that peace might reign. In this way, those who were members of the body of Christ would be prepared to accept what each bishop might teach according to the Word of God and what he might order according to Christian discipline.<sup>142</sup> Concerning the administrative duties of bishops, the canon De variis multiplicibus episcopi muneribus laid down rules for their conduct. Having defined the position of the episcopate according to his reformed understanding, the archbishop stipulated that each bishop should continue to perform the duties laid down in mediaeval canon law. He was to convey sound doctrine in his church, both by himself and through others. He was empowered to convey holy orders at suitable times and to institute suitable ministers to benefices. In the revised Ordinal, such duties belonged to the bishop by virtue of his public commission. In the examination of priests, bishops performed that task 'in the name of the congregation'.<sup>143</sup> Each bishop was to correct corrupt mores and to prescribe ordinances for better living. At certain times, he was to confirm all those instructed in the catechism.<sup>144</sup> The bishop, moreover, possessed no powers of orders. The Articles of Religion insisted that there were only two sacraments, which were defined as baptism and the Lord's

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.

<sup>143</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 346.

<sup>144</sup> R.L.E., pp. 104-5.

Supper.<sup>145</sup> Shorn of the power of orders, a reformed bishop was no mediaeval prelate. He was a co-ordinator and nothing more. When Martin Bucer wrote his treatise De Ordinatione Legitima, he was clear that the office of a bishop should rather be called the office of a superintendent.<sup>146</sup> This, indeed, is the meaning of ἐπίσκοπος. Whilst retaining the Scriptural name of a bishop, Cranmer was clear that this was a bishop's true role. As early as 1535, he had expressed the pious hope that clerics would not set store by titles:

Even at the beginning first of Christ's profession, Diotrephe desired gerere primum in ecclesia...and since, he hath had more successors than all the apostles had, of whom have come all these glorious titles, styles, and pomps into the church.

Contrasting this concept of ministry with his own view, Cranmer told Cromwell that he wished all bishops would leave their styles, calling themselves simply 'apostolos Jesu Christi'.<sup>147</sup>

Strict rules were laid down governing the episcopal familia. From that house, as from a certain treasure, men will be produced who will be able to recognize properly the articles of faith and to collect great knowledge from the bishop concerning the administration of the church. A bishop is to have chaplains around him as preachers, who

<sup>145</sup>P.S., Liturgies, p. 532.

<sup>146</sup>Whitaker, op. cit., p. 183.

<sup>147</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, p. 305; cf. III John, 9.

not only spread abroad the knowledge of Holy Scripture, making good the idleness of others, but who also appoint others from the familia to fulfil the duty. This is one of the ways of relieving the lack of good and faithful ministers. The houses of St Augustine and other Fathers were so ordered.<sup>148</sup> In part, this was simply a continuation of Cranmer's policy in the earlier years of his pontificate. In 1538, for example, Cranmer wrote to Cromwell concerning the living of Shipton Mallet in Somerset. This was the place where Dr Champion, the archbishop's chaplain, was born. Although it was worth £26 a year, Cranmer urged that if Champion received the benefice he would receive more profit than from ten benefices of the same value

by cause that thereby he shall...have  
occasion to do some good continually in  
his native country by preaching there the  
word of God...<sup>149</sup>

The archbishop was insistent that bishops should be resident in their cures. Bishops were to reside unless prevented by church business or the most important business of state. Where bishops have a throne in the cathedral, it is not right that on Sundays they should have the offices in their chapels. They are to go to the cathedral where they must either preach or listen to the sermon, administer communion or receive it. Because of the honour due to them

<sup>148</sup> R.L.E., pp. 105-6.

<sup>149</sup> P.S., Cranmer II, p. 385.

'Sic enim coram eis res gravius gerentur, et conventum sacrum praesentia sua ornabunt'.<sup>150</sup> The Church was embellished not by their grade of office as bishop, but simply by the honour due to that role. It must be noted, however, that many members of the episcopate were resident in their sees in the opening years of the sixteenth century. Professor Scarisbrick has shown that by 1529, only three bishops were involved in political administration. By 1530, only one bishop remained who is known to have performed strictly secular duties. This was Veysey, who was president in the west. Wolsey had dislodged many from influence. Men of the calibre of Fisher and Warham had ceased to be engaged in public affairs.<sup>151</sup>

Colleges within the two universities were to function in relation to the bishop of the diocese in the same way as the familia. If a bishop possessed authority over them, he was enjoined to care for them diligently 'nam ibi quoque Ecclesia habet suorum ministrorum alterum seminarium'.<sup>152</sup> When the archbishop visited the college of All Souls Oxford in 1540, he was concerned with the legal, administrative and spiritual welfare of that body.<sup>153</sup> The charges laid down in the Reformatio Legum, however, concern theological training in the New Divinity. The bishop was to ensure that heads of colleges were competent

<sup>150</sup> R.L.E., p. 107.

<sup>151</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, The Conservative Episcopate in England 1529-1535 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1955), pp. 63-9.

<sup>152</sup> R.L.E., p. 106.

<sup>153</sup> C.R., fols 40-6.



in their knowledge of Holy Scripture. In this way, fellows would be induced to accept it. If care was taken to promote evangelical piety, the colleges would soon be purged. Theological lectures should not be omitted and the bishop was to ensure that the correct number of theologians was always retained in each college.<sup>154</sup>

The activity of ministers in the congregation in no way derogated the rights of the King as supreme head. The fact that the Reformatio Legum is cast throughout in the first person plural testifies to the King's authority within the Church. The King possessed both a spiritual and a temporal sword. The duty of the clergy was to show obedience to the Prince, who possessed authority by the direct grant of God.<sup>155</sup> In this way, clerics taught sound doctrine to the congregation.<sup>156</sup> Consequently, Granmer was happy to affirm the gains in ecclesiastical jurisdiction which the King had made in the 1530s. When a see fell vacant, the archbishop was empowered by the King to administer it:

Jurisdictionem ex privilegio, compositione, vel consuetudine praescripta, per archiepiscopos antehac infra suas provincias usitatam... in futurum exercere posse placuit.<sup>157</sup>

<sup>154</sup> R.L.E., pp. 106-7.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. above, pp. 113-64.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. R.L.E., p. 104.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., p. 200.



Archbishops should also convene provincial synods at the King's command.<sup>158</sup>

The model for Cranmer's concept of the role of priests was taken from I Timothy 3 and Titus I. Theirs was to be a threefold task.<sup>159</sup> Priests were to feed God's flock with the bread of life: 'Gregem Dei sibi commissum verbo vitae subinde nutrant'. This demand stood at the head of Cranmer's charge to them. They were also to enjoin on their flock obedience to God and to ensure mutual goodwill among Christians. This was primarily a pastoral role, which was founded in the demands of Holy Scripture. Dr Rodes has shown that the ideas advocated by Cranmer were more advanced than those embraced by the majority of mediaeval parish clergy.<sup>160</sup> Cranmer maintained that priests were also to be scholars. They were to devote themselves to the study of Holy Scripture and to the preaching of the Word. Each presbyter was to possess a Bible in English and Latin. Dr Peter Heath has shown that in over eight hundred and fifty wills of parish clergy proved in the consistory court at Norwich between 1500 and 1550, Bibles or portions of Bibles occur in seventeen wills. Five of the Bibles were accompanied by commentaries and five clergy left commentaries without

<sup>158</sup> The Submission of the Clergy of 1532 recognized the King's rights. Cf. Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 176-8. In fact, this was a recognition of mediaeval practice. Cf. R.E. Rodes, Ecclesiastical Administration in Medieval England: The Anglo-Saxons to the Reformation (Notre Dame, 1977), p. 108.

<sup>159</sup> R.L.E., pp. 99-100. All the stipulations concerning the priesthood are taken from the canon De Presbyteris.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. Rodes, op. cit., pp. 166-71.

Bibles. All the exegetical works were mediaeval. The works of Erasmus were not represented.<sup>161</sup> Cranmer envisaged that priests should also be models of Christian discipline. They were not to be drunkards, nor gamblers, nor lazy, nor vain. They were to enjoin on their flock obedience to the magistrates. An unmarried priest might have only females of his immediate family to live with him. Following a study of a court book of the dean and chapter of York between 1453 and 1491, Dr Heath has shown that in over fifty parishes during the period ninety-three charges of fornication or adultery were made against eighty-two clergy. Such a picture in the late middle ages hardly gives evidence of outrageous scandal. Adding the forty-seven inconclusive charges to the twenty-one proved, the annual average of offenders was only 1.5%.<sup>162</sup>

Within the mediaeval Church, the deacon was to serve at the altar, to read the gospels, to baptize and to preach. At his ordination, the deacon received the gospels and was clothed with stole and dalmatic.<sup>163</sup> Many of the functions of the mediaeval deacon were retained in the

<sup>161</sup> Cf. P. Heath, The English Parish Clergy on the Eve of the Reformation (London, 1969), pp. 86-92, especially pp. 88-9. Dr Heath acknowledges that books were sometimes not mentioned in wills and that probate inventories do not exist for the period. He concludes, however, that the surviving evidence is at least representative of the whole. Out of 869 wills of parish clergy, books were mentioned in 158.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., pp. 118-19.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

reformed ministry envisaged by Cranmer. In the Reformatio Legum, the deacon was directed to assist the priest in divine service, particularly at communion.<sup>164</sup> He was also to be a teacher, being empowered to read Holy Scripture and the Homilies in the congregation, to instruct the young in the Catechism and to preach.<sup>165</sup> Primarily, however, theirs was to be a pastoral role. In this, Cranmer was influenced by Acts 6 and the appointment of Stephen and six others to undertake the Sid Kovid to the widows.<sup>166</sup> The Reformatio Legum enjoined:

Diaconus erit patronus pauperum, ut languidos confirmet, soletur vinctos, inopes juvet; eritque pater orphanis, patronus viduis, et solatium afflictis et miseris, quantum in illo est, omnibus.<sup>167</sup>

He was also to bring the names of the poor to the parish priest so that, at his persuasion, the whole church might be moved to provide for their needs.<sup>168</sup> In the order of deacons, the Scriptural insights of the archbishop are to be seen at their most profound.

In the Reformatio Legum, archdeacons were to be seen as 'proximus post episcopum et ejus vicarium'. The post was not to be seen as one of great dignity, for the

<sup>164</sup> R.L.E., p. 99. Cf. P.S., Liturgies, p. 340; cf. ibid., pp. 169-70.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.; cf. ibid., p. 340.

<sup>166</sup> Acts 6, v. 1. In the prayers during the service for The Ordering of Deacons, Stephen is explicitly invoked as an exemplar in such work. Cf. P.S., Liturgies, pp. 168 and 338.

<sup>167</sup> R.L.E., p. 99.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid.

archdeacon was simply a 'minister Domini'.<sup>169</sup> Dr Rodes has shown that in the middle ages, the chief duties of the archdeacon were to supervise the clergy within the archdeaconry, to institute clerks into parochial benefices, to hold visitations and to administer justice in his court.<sup>170</sup> In fact, most archdeacons gained more in terms of financial benefit than they expended in regard to pastoral care. Popes recognized this by bestowing upon archdeacons permission to perform their functions by deputy. Professor Storey has shown that in the fifteenth century, the commissary general had replaced the archdeacon as the oculus episcopi.<sup>171</sup> In the Reformatio Legum, however, the archdeacon is once more to fulfil that role. Cranmer retained the distinction between the archdeacon's administrative and judicial functions. The archbishop attempted to place great stress upon their administrative and pastoral duties. The archdeacon was to be 'in perpetuis excubiis, ut qui in functionibus sunt inferioribus, diligenter suum officium faciant'.<sup>172</sup> It was in this way that he was to become oculus episcopi. Archdeacons were to reside in their archdeaconry, to preach and to give nourishment(pascent). If they failed to do this, they were to suffer deprivation.

Cathedrals and their chapters were also to be retained within the archbishop's new code. Dr Rodes has

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. Rodes, op. cit., pp. 102-3.

<sup>171</sup> R.L. Storey, Diocesan Administration in Fifteenth Century England. 2nd ed.(York, 1972), p. 8.

<sup>172</sup> Cf. R.L.E., p. 101.

shown that cathedral chapters possessed only limited powers of administration in diocesan affairs.<sup>173</sup> During the vacancy in an episcopal see, chapters possessed rights in certain dioceses over sede vacante administration.<sup>174</sup> Such rights were upheld by Cranmer in the Reformatio Legum.<sup>175</sup> The archbishop also laid down that the foundation statutes of cathedrals were to be accepted as long as they were not contrary to the Word of God and the King's religious constitutions. Deans were retained as heads of each cathedral chapter. There were to be public sermons in each cathedral every Sunday.<sup>176</sup> Each dean was to ensure that the sacred rites were performed and that everything was done with due order. As the archdeacon was outside the cathedral, so the dean was inside that institution: 'episcopo sint adjumento, quasi duo ejus membra utilissima et necessaria'.<sup>177</sup> For this reason, deans were not to be absent from their charge.<sup>178</sup> Under Henry VIII and Edward VI, royal servants sometimes held such posts. In 1546, Nicholas Wotton was granted a royal dispensation to hold the deaneries of Canterbury and York.<sup>179</sup> Wotton, however, was often absent on diplomatic business for the government. At Canterbury, he attempted to influence chapter business by the despatch

<sup>173</sup> Rhodes, op. cit., pp. 101-2.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Churchill, Administration, I, pp. 161-240 and II, pp. 41-118.

<sup>175</sup> B.L.E., p. 200.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., p. 331.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., pp. 102-3.

<sup>179</sup> Cf. C.C.A.L., Register U, fols 149-v.

of letters.<sup>180</sup>

Martin Luther maintained that 'whoever has the office of preaching...has the highest office in Christendom'. He castigated the bishops, for they left 'the very highest office of the word, which should be their own, in the hands of the very lowest'.<sup>181</sup>

Thomas Cranmer likewise insisted that 'Quoniam concionandi munus populo Dei maxime necessarium est, Ecclesia nunquam illo destitui debet'.<sup>182</sup>

Cranmer insisted that preachers must possess an internal and obtain an external call. The method of appointing such men was to be by episcopal licence: 'praesulum auctoritatem ad concionatores in Ecclesiis disponendos intercedere volumus'.<sup>183</sup>

In part, this was simply a continuation of current practice. The archiepiscopal Registers at York, for example, record that in July 1539 preaching licences were granted 'ad requisitionem domini Cant' archiepiscopi'.<sup>184</sup> Cranmer insisted in the Reformatio Legum that licences were to be issued by bishops

ne quisquam ad officium tam praeclarum assumatur, nisi pietatem ad illum locum, et convenientem doctrinam secum adferat.<sup>185</sup>

Unless bishops performed their duty, no-one was to be admitted to the office of preacher. The appointment of

<sup>180</sup> D.N.B., sub nomine. Cf., for example, C.C.A.L., Christ Church Letters, III, no. 8.

<sup>181</sup> L.W., 39, p. 314.

<sup>182</sup> R.L.E., p. 35.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>184</sup> B.I., Register 28, fol. 137v.

<sup>185</sup> R.L.E., pp. 35-6.



preachers, moreover, was performed by a bishop on behalf of the congregation. The Articles of Religion stressed that bishops possessed 'public authority given unto them in the congregation'.<sup>186</sup> Bishops were not to accept everyone puffed up by the Spirit. Rather, they were to consider the candidate's life and learning to see whether they possessed an internal call from God.<sup>187</sup>

Preachers must not pay heed to heretical books, particularly those of Anabaptists.<sup>188</sup> They themselves must demonstrate sensitivity and humility in the performance of their duties.<sup>189</sup> The principal role amongst those called to be preachers belonged to the archbishops.<sup>190</sup> By the canon De convocandis per episcopum concionatoribus, Cranmer allowed diocesan bishops to summon before them all the preachers in the diocese at certain times of the year so that there might be common agreement over doctrine. Such meetings, however, were not simply assemblies in which the bishops gave instruction. The preachers themselves were to report what evils they had found, the places in which they were most evident and the cures which might be used to eradicate such vices. In this way, 'communi quadam conspiratione concionatorum improbitas coerceatur, et pietas dilatetur'.<sup>191</sup> The power to summon preachers together and

<sup>186</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 532.

<sup>187</sup> R.L.E., p. 36.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., pp. 36-7.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., pp. 37-8.

to examine the content of their sermons already existed in mediaeval canon law. Before Thomas Cromwell began his supervision of the activities of preachers, the archbishop of Canterbury along with the bishops of London, Winchester and Lincoln had agreed to inhibit preachers following seditious sermons concerning the King's marriage. Instructions were to be given to each preacher before a new licence might be obtained.<sup>192</sup>

In Cranmer's manuscript of the Reformatio Legum, three chapters deal with the order of sermons in various churches. Annotations show that they were to be placed elsewhere in the code, but the scribes have not done so.<sup>193</sup> In towns and villages, there was to be a sermon each Sunday and holy day. One of the Homilies was to be read if a sermon could not be preached. There was, however, to be a minimum of four original sermons each year.<sup>194</sup> Dr Rodes has shown that three or four sermons was the goal for parish priests in the thirteenth century. By the fourteenth century, weekly sermons were encouraged.<sup>195</sup> The complaints of the parishoners of Ash in Kent in 1535 reveal the problems which Cranmer had to face. The benefice belonged to the canons of the college of Wingham. The parishoners explained that twenty-one years ago, there had

<sup>192</sup>P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 283-4.

<sup>193</sup>Cf. R.L.E., pp. 330-1.

<sup>194</sup>Ibid., p. 331.

<sup>195</sup>R.E. Rodes, Ecclesiastical Administration in Medieval England: The Anglo-Saxons to the Reformation (Notre Dame, 1977), pp. 127-8 and 168.



always been a resident vicar. The canons, however, had taken possession of the vicarage and let it to farm to temporal men. The latter had obtained curates as cheaply as possible. Within the space of three months, there had been seven curates. This had caused much strife among the five hundred residents.<sup>196</sup> Such a situation did little to promote a sounding preaching ministry. As archbishop of York, Edward Lee bemoaned the state of his diocese. Only twelve secular priests could preach. Many benefices were so poor that men would not accept them. Those who had the best benefices were non-resident.<sup>197</sup> Thomas Cranmer had firm convictions concerning the office of preaching. With Martin Luther, he could have said that 'where there is no office of preaching, none of the others can follow'.<sup>198</sup>

The archbishop's concern for the external call of ministers is to be seen in the rules laid down in the canon De Admittendis ad Ecclesiastica Beneficia.<sup>199</sup> Cranmer admitted that ambitious men ruled the Church 'quia in re multum et longe longeque plurimum ab illis beati Pauli formulis recessum est'.<sup>200</sup> All ministers were to be examined before they were admitted into the ministry.<sup>201</sup> Private

<sup>196</sup> L.P., IX, 1110

<sup>197</sup> Ibid., VIII, 963.

<sup>198</sup> L.W., 39, p. 314.

<sup>199</sup> R.L.E., pp. 59-70.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., p. 59.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid.

patronage was to be retained; such patrons possessed a sacred task.<sup>202</sup> In the bestowal of benefices, patrons were not

to retain buildings or tithes. Should they do this, they were to lose the right of presentation.<sup>203</sup> Benefices were not to be vacant for more than six months.<sup>204</sup> This was the same period allowed under mediaeval canon law.<sup>205</sup> Should

six months elapse, the presentation was to pass to the bishop.<sup>206</sup> This was the rule of mediaeval canon law.

Between 1559 and 1565, Matthew Parker as archbishop of Canterbury instituted 169 men to benefices. The archbishop presented to 35% of these vacancies pleno iure and to an additional 7% by reason of lapse of time.<sup>207</sup>

Important rules govern the examination of those on whom a benefice is bestowed. The Reformatio Legum laid down 'nec admittatur ullus ad Ecclesiam administrandam, nisi prius rite fuerit examinatus'.<sup>208</sup> Under mediaeval canon law, such an enquiry was to be made by a jury of clergy and laity summoned by the archdeacon or his official. If the presentee was not well known, a special enquiry was set up in the place from which he had come. The scope of the enquiry was wide. Information was sought concerning the benefice and its patron, the age and orders of the

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., pp. 59-60.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., pp. 60-1.

<sup>205</sup> Heath, op. cit., p. 31.

<sup>206</sup> R.L.E., pp. 60-1.

<sup>207</sup> M.L. Zell, 'The personnel of the clergy of Kent, in the Reformation period' in E.H.R., LXXXIX(1974), p. 527 n. 3 and p. 528 n.

<sup>208</sup> R.L.E., p. 59.

presentee, whether he held another benefice, his life and conversation, his learning and legitimacy.<sup>209</sup> The archbishop consciously drew upon such mediaeval practices in the rules he gave for such examinations. He maintained that the bishop must first appoint cognitores.<sup>210</sup> It is unclear from existing evidence whether Cranmer envisaged them exercising powers of examination on behalf of the congregation. The archbishop acknowledged that in mediaeval canon law, the task of examination was the prerogative of the archdeacon.<sup>211</sup> Cranmer, however, maintained that bishops should concern themselves with such enquiries: 'Munus enim hoc unum est ex omnibus summum et maximum, in quo status ecclesiarum praecipue fundatus est'.<sup>212</sup> In performing such a task, Cranmer insisted that bishops acted on behalf of the congregation.<sup>213</sup>

The Reformatio Legum stipulated that those presented to benefices must answer questions concerning their doctrine. The questions concerned the doctrine of the Trinity, the importance of Holy Scripture, an investigation of religious controversies with an emphasis on those in recent times, and finally an investigation into the meaning of the Catechism. In particular, all those matters set out in the canon De Haereticis were to be examined lest the candidate himself

<sup>209</sup> Rodas, op. cit., p. 117.

<sup>210</sup> R.L.E., p. 61.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., pp. 61-2.

<sup>213</sup> P.S., Liturgies, p. 532.

had embraced heretical doctrine.<sup>214</sup> Above all, jurors were to discover whether

ad illa beati Pauli praecepta se velit  
accomodare quae sunt ad Timotheum his verbis.  
Tu vero vigila, in omnibus labora, opus fac  
evangelistae, ministerium tuum imple.<sup>215</sup>

Questions were also to be posed concerning the candidate's legitimacy.<sup>216</sup> When William Knight was appointed as bishop of Bath and Wells in 1541, John Dakyn and Thomas Brightman testified that Knight was 'legitimum natum' and that his parents were duly married.<sup>217</sup>

When the enquiry was over, the candidate was to swear to reject the authority of the bishop of Rome and to acknowledge that the King was supreme head of the church of England on earth after Christ. He was also to swear obedience to his bishop.<sup>218</sup> Under mediaeval canon law, an oath of obedience was already sworn to the bishop. The text of the oath does not survive in Thomas Cranmer's Register. Following the political settlement of the 1530s, clerics were to swear obedience to the King as supreme head when they were instituted to their benefices.<sup>219</sup> Strangely, evidence that such an oath was taken by the clergy survives in Cranmer's Register only from the period

<sup>214</sup> Ibid., pp. 61-3.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., p. 63; the words 'Tu...imple' are in italics in the printed version of the Reformatio Legum.

<sup>216</sup> R.L.E., pp. 65-6.

<sup>217</sup> L.P.L., C.R., fol. 267.

<sup>218</sup> R.L.E., p. 69.

<sup>219</sup> Cf. above, pp. 83-5.

following the appointment of Anthony Huse as registrar in 1538. When Robert Harvy was appointed as commissary of Calais in 1540, he had first to swear an oath

de renunciando, refutando et recusando  
Romano pontifice, eius auctoritate et  
iurisdictione usurpatis iuxta et secundum  
vim, formam et effectum statuti parliamenti  
regni Anglie in hac parte editi et provisi...<sup>221</sup>

Dr Heal has found similar evidence in Ely diocese during the reign of Edward VI.<sup>222</sup>

The Reformatio Legum stipulated that once the enquiry was over, letters were to be directed to the candidate by the bishop. Although the term is not used, these letters were equivalent to mediaeval letters of institution.<sup>223</sup> No separate mention of induction is made in the Reformatio Legum.

Within the canon De Admittendis ad Ecclesiastica Beneficia, the practice of holding benefices in plurality was criticized. Cranmer maintained with some simplicity that:

Privilegia quorum auctoritate multa sacerdotia  
possunt in unum ministrum confluere, posthac  
nemini volumus indulgeri.<sup>224</sup>

Dispensations for plurality occur frequently in the registers of the archbishop's faculty office. Dr Chambers has shown

<sup>220</sup> C.R., fols 339-426v.

<sup>221</sup> Ibid., fol. 22v.

<sup>222</sup> F. Heal, The Bishops of Ely and their diocese during the Reformation period: C.A. 1515-1600 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1972), p. 69.

<sup>223</sup> R.L.E., pp. 69-70; cf. Heath, op. cit., pp. 41-2.

<sup>224</sup> R.L.E., pp. 63-4.

that between 1534 and 1549 the faculty office issued over eight hundred dispensations for the holding of various benefices in plurality.<sup>225</sup> The Reformatio Legum, however, allowed clerks not to reside in their benefices for causes approved by the bishop. This was a continuation of mediaeval practice. In March 1543, the archbishop licensed Robert Peterson as dean of South Malling to be absent at pleasure from the college on account of ill health.<sup>226</sup>

It is within the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum that Thomas Cranmer's mature ideas concerning administration are to be found. His failure to secure the implementation of the code was a severe blow to his wish to reform the administration of the church of England. On theological grounds, the archbishop was clear that the Church might exercise powers of administration. In his concept of ministry, the archbishop affirmed that ordination was no longer to be seen as a sacrament. His retention of the threefold ministry of bishop, priest and deacon was carefully grounded in Scriptural teachings and linked to his concept of the priesthood of all believers. A bishop was no mighty mediaeval prelate, but a co-ordinator who exercised power by divine ordinance on behalf of the congregation. In promulgating rules for the scope of ministers' duties, Cranmer retained many of the regulations to be found in

---

<sup>225</sup> D.S. Chambers, Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549 (Oxford, 1966), pp. xxxvii-viii.

<sup>226</sup> R.L.E., p. 64; C.R., fol. 19.

mediaeval canon law. Theological considerations, however, bound the strands of the archbishop's thought firmly together. Thomas Cranmer's concept of ministry was cast in the reformed tradition. His failure to secure the implementation of the Reformatio Legum marks the archbishop as a reformer from the first generation of Protestant pastors in England who did not fully achieve his aims.



### CONCLUSION

Thomas Cranmer's Register in Lambeth Palace Library forms an important, albeit incomplete, record of the archbishop's administration in diocese and province. Called from relative obscurity in 1533 to be archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer was thrust into the heady world of Tudor politics.

The government's use of the archbishop's diocesan and metropolitan jurisdiction enabled them to control that prelate's powers to enforce the political settlement in the country. With the creation of the Vice-Gerency, the archbishop of Canterbury was no longer the principal minister of the King's spiritual jurisdiction. Cromwell used his office as Vice-Gerent with skill and insight to place the authority of the English episcopate upon new foundations. He himself was able to supplement the jurisdiction of the archbishop as metropolitan.

Thomas Cranmer's Commonplace Books give evidence of his efforts to elaborate a doctrine of Christian Obedience. The Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum shows that by the 1550s, Thomas Cranmer had evolved a careful plan to reform the administration of the English church. The key to such an attempt was the archbishop's concept of ministry.

Thomas Cranmer was able to implement certain reforms in diocese and province and he used traditional practices to achieve that end. It is clear, nonetheless, that there are many parallels in Cranmer's Register with the Registers of his mediaeval forbears. The theological and political



reformation of the sixteenth century left unchanged certain aspects of ecclesiastical administration and church life.

In asserting its claims to supremacy within the English church, the Tudor monarchy strove to extirpate Roman jurisdiction in England. Cranmer fully accepted such claims on theological grounds and strove to implement spiritual and administrative reforms in diocese and province. Such reforms were grounded in the tenets of the New Divinity. All such developments find no parallel in mediaeval episcopal Registers. The Reformatio Legum contains Cranmer's mature ideas concerning administration and discipline in the English church.

A P P E N D I X : Documents from Thomas  
Cranmer's Register and Thomas Cromwell's  
Register as vicegerent

## EDITORIAL PRACTICE

A complete guide to the editorial method adopted below is to be found in R.F. Hannisett, Editing Records for Publication (London, 1977). Each document has been assigned a number which is given at the head of the transcript or calendar. The foliation of the bound MS. is given in square brackets. In transcripts, the use of capitals has been restricted and a modern usage adopted. The spelling of the original has been maintained and scribal idiosyncracies in spelling have been retained where they do not obscure the meaning of the text. All abbreviations have been extended where this can be done with confidence. A modern system of punctuation has been imposed on the documents. In transcripts of English documents, the thorn has been rendered by its modern typographical equivalent. Editorial corrections in the text are indicated as such in the footnotes. The use of square brackets in the text indicates that the MS. reading is unclear. Examples of each type of administrative act and all the more important documents have been transcribed below. Previous editions of each document are noted in the footnotes. Wilkins did not retain the medieval spelling of Latin documents. Cox did not reproduce the original spelling of English documents. Calendars have been made as concise as possible. All dates in calendars and in the headings to transcripts are given in the Old Style except that the year has been taken to begin on 1 January. In

calendars, the regnal year of the monarch has been noted in all cases. The archiepiscopal year of consecration is omitted except where it supplements other forms of dating. Editorial insertions in calendars have been placed in square brackets. Personal names have been noted in their original forms. Place names have been modernized and the original spellings placed in parentheses. A Glossary of MS. spellings of place and personal names is given at the end of the texts. A table of abbreviations used in the calendars below precedes the edition of the texts.

ABBREVIATIONS

B.A. - bachelor of arts

B.V.M. - Blessed Virgin Mary

Cl.L.P. - professor of civil laws

Cn & Cl.L.B. - bachelor of canon and civil laws

D. Cn & Cl.L. - doctor of canon and civil laws

Dec. D. - doctor of decrees

Esq. - esquire

gent. - gentleman

Kl. - calends

Kt - knight

LL.B. - bachelor of laws

LL.D. - doctor of laws

M. - magister

M.A. - master of arts

M.D. - doctor of medicine

M. Th. - master of theology

Non. - nones

S.T.B. - bachelor of theology

PAPAL BULLS : THOMAS CRANMER'S

REGISTER FOLS 1 - 5v.

REGISTRUM REVERENDISSIMI IN  
CRISTO PATRIS ET DOMINI  
DOMINI THOME PERMISSIONE  
DIVINA CANTUARIENSIS ARCHIEPISCOPI  
TOTIUS ANGLIE PRIMATIS <sup>1</sup>

1[fol. 1-v.]

Bull from Pope Clement VII<sup>2</sup> to King Henry VIII notifying him of the provision of Thomas Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, vacant by the death of William [Warham], former archbishop. Stressing that grace and praise are gained by bishops through the King's favour, the Pope requests the King 'fili carissime sic virtutis', to bestow his favour upon the archbishop-elect. Bologna(Bononie), 9 kl. March[21 Feb.] 1533.<sup>3</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>There is a blank space between the main heading and the body of the first entry. <sup>2</sup>The papal style runs: 'Clemens episcopus servus servorum Dei'. <sup>3</sup>The original bull survives in P.R.O., C. 82. 667; L.P., VI, 417(27)]

2[fols 1v.-2]

Bull to the archbishop-elect notifying him of the form of the oath of loyalty to be taken at his consecration. Reciting the fact of papal provision, the archbishop is empowered to receive consecration from any catholic bishop, with two or three

assistants, who are in communion with the holy see, provided that he first offer to the consecrating bishop an oath of loyalty to the Roman Church, under pain of suspension on all parties. The form of the oath of loyalty is:

EGO THOMAS electus Cantuariensis ab hac hora inantea  
fidelis et obediens ero beato Petro sanoteque apostolice  
Romane Ecclesie ac domino nostro domino Clementi Pape VII<sup>o</sup>  
suisque successoribus canonice intrantibus. Non ero in  
consilio aut consensu vel facto ut vitam perdant aut membrum,  
seu capiantur, aut in eos manus violenter quomodolibet  
ingerantur vel iniurie aliq[ue] inferantur quovis quesito  
colore. Consilium vero quod michi credituri sunt n[on] e[ss]e  
aut nuncios seu litteras ad eorum damnum me sciente  
nemini pandam. Papatum [R]omanum et regalia Sancti Petri  
adiutor eis ero ad retinendum et defendendum cont[r]a  
omnem hominem. Legatum apostolice sedis in eundo et redeundo  
honorifice tractabo et in suis necessitatibus adiuvabo.  
Iura, honores, privilegia et auctoritatem Romane Ecclesie  
domini nostri Pape et successorum predictorum conservare  
et defendere, augere et promovere curabo. Non ero in consilio,  
facto vel tractatu in quibus contra ipsum dominum nostrum  
vel Romanam Ecclesiam aliqua sinistra vel preiudicialia  
personarum, iuris, honoris, status et potestatis eorum  
machinentur, et si talia a quibuscunque procurari novero  
vel tractari impediam hoc pro posse et quantotius potero,  
commode significabo [et] idem domino nostro vel alteri per  
quem ad ipsius noticiam pervenire possit. Regulas sanctorum  
patrum, decreta, ordinationes, sentencias, dispensationes.



reservationes, provisiones et mandata apostolica totis  
viribus observabo et faciam ab aliis observari. Hereticos,  
scismaticos et rebelles domino nostro et successoribus  
predictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo. Vocatus ad  
sinodum veniam nisi prepeditus fuero canonica prepeditione.  
Apostolorum limina Romana curia existente citra singulis  
annis ultra vero montes singulis bienniis visitabo aut  
per me aut per meum nuncium nisi apostolica absolvar licencia.  
Possessiones vero ad mensam meam pertinentes non vendam,  
neque donabo, nec impignorabo, neque de novo infeudabo  
vel aliquomodo alienabo etiam cum consensu capituli ecclesie  
mee inconsulto Romano pontifice. Sic me Deus adiuvet et hec  
sancta Dei evangelia. Bologna, 8 kl. March[22 Feb.] 1533.

3  
 Dispensation, addressed to Thomas Cranmer, M. Th., archdeacon  
 of Taunton(Tawnton), in the diocese of Bath and Wells;  
 reciting the fact that Cranmer is to be provided to the  
 vacant metropolitical see of Canterbury, the Pope releases  
 him from all ecclesiastical sentences, censures and penalties  
 which might impede the preferment. Bologna, 9 kl. March[21 Feb.]  
 1533.

4[fol. 2-v,]  
[21 Feb. 1533. Bull of provision from Pope Clement VII

addressed to Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury elect]

CLEMENS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI dilecto filio Thome electo Cantuariensi, salutem et benedictionem. Divina disponente clemencia, cuius inscrutabili providencia ordinationem suscipiunt universa in apostolice [dignitatis] specula meritis licet imparibus constituti, ad universas orbis ecclesias [aciem] nostre considerationis extendimus et pro earum statu salubriter dirigendo apostolici favoris auxilium adhibemus. Sed de illis propensius cogitare nos convenit quas propriis carere pastoribus intuemur ut eis iuxta cor nostrum viri preficiantur ydonei, qui commissos sibi populos per suam circumspectionem providam et providenciam circumspectam salubriter dirigant et informent ac bona ecclesiarum ipsarum non solum gubernent utiliter sed etiam multimodis efferant[fol. 2v.] incrementis. Dudum siquidem bone memorie Willelmo archiepiscopo Cantuariensi regimini ecclesie Cantuariensi presidente, nos cupientes eidem ecclesie cum vacaret per apostolice sedis providenciam utilem et ydoneam presidere personam, provisionem eiusdem ecclesie ordinationi et dispositioni nostre duximus ea vice specialiter reservandam, decernentes extunc irritum et inane si secus super hiis per quoscumque quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter contigeret attemptari. Postmodum vero, prefata ecclesia per obitum eiusdem Willelmi qui extra Romanam curiam debitum nature persolvit pastoris solacio destituta,

nos vacatione huiusmodi fidedignis relatibus intellecta  
 ad provisionem eiusdem ecclesie celerem et felicem, de qua  
 nullus preter nos hac vice se intromittere potuit sive potest  
 reservatione et decreto obsistentibus supradictis, ne ecclesia  
 ipsa longe vacationis exponatur incommodis, paternis et  
 sollicitis studiis intendentes post deliberationem quam  
 de preficiendo eidem ecclesie personam utilem et etiam  
 fructuosam cum fratribus nostris habuimus diligentem, demum  
 ad te archidiaconum de Tawnton in ecclesia Wellensi magistrum  
 in theologia in presbyteratus ordine constitutum, pro quo  
 carissimus in Christo filius noster Henricus Anglie Rex  
 illustris nobis super hoc humiliter supplicavit, et cui  
 apud nos de vite munditia honestate morum spiritualium  
 providencia et temporalium circumspectione aliisque multiplicum  
 virtutum donis fidedigna testimonia perhibentur, direximus oculos  
 nostre mentis. Quibus omnibus debita meditatione pensatis de  
 persona tua nobis et fratribus ipsis ob tuorum exigentiam  
 meritorum accepta prefate ecclesie de eorundem fratrum consilio  
 apostolica auctoritate providemus, teque illi in archiepiscopum  
 preficimus et pastorem curam et administrationem ipsius  
 ecclesie tibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenarie  
 committendo in illo qui dat gracias et largitur premia,  
 confidentes quod dirigente Domino actus tuos prefata ecclesia  
 sub tuo felici regimine regetur utiliter et prospere dirigetur  
 ac grata in eisdem spiritualibus et temporalibus suscipiet  
 incrementa. Iugum igitur Domini tuis impositum humeris prompta  
 devotione suscipiens, curam et administrationem predictas  
 sic exercere studeas sollicite fideliter et prudenter quod

ecclesia ipsa gubernatori provide et fructuoso administratori  
gaudeat se commissam, tuque preter eterne retributionis premium  
nostram et apostolice sedis benedictionem et gratiam exinde  
uberius consequi merearis. Dat' Bononie anno Incarnationis  
Dominice millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo secundo, nono  
kl. marcii pontificatus nostri anno decimo.

5

Bull to the bishops of the southern province, which recites the  
fact of papal provision[of. 1] and enjoins obedience to  
the archbishop elect. Bologna, 9 kl. March[21 Feb.] 1533.

6[fol. 3]

Similar bull to the clergy of the city and diocese of  
Canterbury[of. 5]. Should they not show obedience to the  
archbishop elect, the Pope will ratify the archiepiscopal  
sentence against those who withdraw loyalty. Bologna,  
9 kl. March[21 Feb.] 1533.

7

Similar bull to the chapter of Canterbury cathedral[of. 6].  
Bologna, 9 kl March[21 Feb.] 1533.

8[fol. 3-v.]

Similar bull to the archbishop's tenants[cf. 6; with an additional demand for due services and rights to be offered]. Bologna, 9 kl. March[21 Feb.] 1533.

9

Similar bull to the people of the city and diocese of Canterbury[cf. 5]. Bologna, 9 kl. March[21 Feb.] 1533.

10[fol. 3v.-4]

Bull to the archbishop elect notifying him of the despatch of the pallium, 'insigne...plenitudinis pontificalis officii', taken from the body of St Peter and postulated by the archbishop's proctor, M. Francis Coluccius of Pisa(Pistia), scribe in the papal familia. Coluccius is to convey it to the archbishop of York and to the bishop of London, one or both of whom may bestow it upon the archbishop following his consecration and their reception of the oath of loyalty to the Roman Church. The archbishop is to use it on the days specified in the privileges of his church. He is also to further the privileges of the church of Canterbury in spirituals and temporals. Bologna, 5 non. March[3 March], 1533.

8[fol. 3-v.]

Similar bull to the archbishop's tenants[cf. 6; with an additional demand for due services and rights to be offered].

Bologna, 9 kl. March[21 Feb.] 1533.

2

Similar bull to the people of the city and diocese of Canterbury[cf. 5]. Bologna, 9 kl. March[21 Feb.] 1533.

10[fols 3v.-4]

Bull to the archbishop elect notifying him of the despatch of the pallium, 'insigne...plenitudinis pontificalis officii', taken from the body of St Peter and postulated by the archbishop's proctor, M. Francis Coluccius of Pisa(Pistia), scribe in the papal familia. Coluccius is to convey it to the archbishop of York and to the bishop of London, one or both of whom may bestow it upon the archbishop following his consecration and their reception of the oath of loyalty to the Roman Church. The archbishop is to use it on the days specified in the privileges of his church. He is also to further the privileges of the church of Canterbury in spirituals and temporals. Bologna, 5 non. March[3 March], 1533.

11A

Bull concerning the above to the archbishop of York and to the bishop of London[of. 10]. They are to ensure that the archbishop elect despatches to the Pope the oath of loyalty in letters patent under his seal as quickly as possible.  
Bologna, 5 non. March[3 March], 1533.

11B

[The form of words to be used at the bestowal of the pallium]

AD HONOREM DEI OMNIPOTENTIS et Beate Marie Virginis ac  
beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli et domini nostri domini  
Clementis septimi et sanote Romane Ecclesie necnon Cantuariensis  
ecclesie tibi commisse, tibi tradimus pallium de corpore  
Beati Petri sumptum, plenitudinem videlicet pontificalis  
officii, ut eo utaris infra ecclesiam tuam certis diebus qui  
exprimuntur in privilegiis et ab apostolica sede concessis.

12

[A public instrument, drawn up under the direction of Richard  
Watkins, protonotary to the King, recording the protestation  
made by the archbishop elect before his consecration and  
the form of the oath of loyalty taken at the reception of the  
pallium in St Stephen's college, Westminster, on 30 March. 1533]



IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. Per presentis publici instrumenti  
 seriem cunctis appareat evidenter et sit notum quod anno  
 Domini millesimo quingentesimo trigesimo tercio indictione  
 sexta regni illustrissimi, metuendissimi ac invictissimi  
 principis et domini nostri supremi Henrici octavi Dei gracia  
 Anglie et Francie Regis, fidei defensoris et Domini Hibernie  
 excellentissimi anno vicesimo quarto mensis vero marcii die  
 tricesimo in domo capitulari collegii regii Sancti Stephani  
 protho[fol. 4v.]martiris prope palacium regium Westmon' London'  
 diocesis notorie situata constitutus personaliter reverendissimus  
 in Christo pater dominus Thomas in Cant' archiepiscopus, ut  
 dicebat, electus in mea prothonotarii regii ac notarii subscripti  
 ac venerabilium virorum Magistrorum Joannis Tregonwell legum  
 doctoris et Thome Bedyll clerici a consiliis dicti domini nostri  
 Regis, Ricardi Gwent decretorum doctoris curie Cant' officialis  
 principalis et Joannis Cockes legum doctoris dicti reverendissimi  
 patris audiencie causarum et negociorum auditoris ac vicarii  
 in spiritualibus generalis testium in hac parte specialiter  
 adhibitorum presenciam protestationes quasdam fecit, legit et  
 interposuit ac cetera fecit prout in quadam papiri schedula, quam  
 tunc ibidem in manibus suis tenuit et perlegit, plenius  
 continebatur. Cuius quidem schedule verus tenor nil addito  
 vel dempto de verbo ad verbum sequitur et est talis:

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. Coram vobis autentica persona et  
 testibus fidedignis hic presentibus ego Thomas in Cant'  
 archiepiscopus electus dico, allego et in hiis scriptis palam,  
 publice et expresse protestior quod cum iuramentum sive iuramenta



ab electis in Cant' archiepiscopos summo pontifici prestari solita, me ante meam consecrationem aut tempore eiusdem pro forma potius quam pro esse aut re obligatoria ad illam obtinendam oporteat. Non est nec erit mee voluntatis aut intentionis per huiusmodi iuramentum vel iuramenta, qualitercumque verba in ipsis posita sonare videbuntur, me obligare ad aliquod ratione eorundem posthac dicendum, faciendum aut attemptandum quod erit aut esse videbitur contra legem Dei vel contra illustrissimum Regem nostrum Anglie aut rempublicam huius sui regni Anglie leges ve aut prerogativas eiusdem; et quod non intendo per huiusmodi iuramentum aut iuramenta quoviamodo me obligare quominus libere loqui, consulere et consentire valeam in omnibus et singulis reformationem religionis cristiane, gubernationem ecclesie anglicane aut prerogativam corone eiusdem rei publice commoditatem quoquomodo concernentibus et ea ubique exequi et reformare que mihi in ecclesia anglicana reformanda videbuntur; et secundum hanc interpretationem et intellectum hunc et non aliter neque alio modo dicta iuramenta me prestiturum<sup>1</sup> protestor et profiteor. Protestorque insuper, quodcumque iuramentum sit quod meus procurator summo pontifici meo nomine antehac prestitit, quod non erat intentionis aut voluntatis mee sibi aliquam dare potestatem cuius vigore aliquod iuramentum meo nomine prestare potuerit contrarium aut repugnans iuramento per me prestito aut imposterum prestando prefato illustrissimo Anglie Regi; et casu quo aliquod tale contrarium aut repugnans iuramentum meo nomine prestit, protestor quod illud me inscio et absque mea auctoritate

prestitum pro nullo et invalido esse volo. Quas protestationes in omnibus clausulis et sentenciis dictorum iuramentorum repetitas et reiteratas volo; a quibus per aliquod meum factum vel dictum quovismodo recedere non intendo nec recedam, sed eas mihi semper salvas esse volo.<sup>2</sup>

SUPER quibus omnibus et singulis premissis dictus reverendissimus pater me prothonotarium et notarium predictum unum vel plura publicum seu publica instrumentum sive instrumenta exinde conficere ac testes superius nominatos testimonium perhibere rogavit et requisivit; et deinde die, mense et anno predictis dictus reverendissimus dominus Thomas electus in mea et prelibatorum venerabilium virorum presencia testium ad hoc etiam adhibitorum dictam domum capitularem exivit ac ad gradus summi altaris dicti collegii vestibus sacerdotalibus amictus ad recipiendum munus consecrationis perrexit. Ac ibidem coram reverendo in Christo patre domino Johanne permissione divina Lincoln' episcopo pontificalibus induto supra cathedram honorifice ornatam sedente, reverendis patribus[fol. 5] Johanne Exon' et Henrico Assavensi episcopis eidem Lincoln' episcopo in actu consecrationis dicti reverendissimi electi assistentibus, genibus innixus quandam pargameni schedulam tenoris subsequenter videlicet:

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. Ego Thomas electus Cantuariensis as in the bull to the archbishop elect notifying him of the form of the oath of loyalty down to the words et hec sancta Dei evangelia]<sup>3</sup> manibus suis tenens. Ante lecturam eiusdem schedule et iuramenti in eadem contenti<sup>4</sup> prestationem, in mea

et eorundem testium presencia asseruit et protestatus est se diotam schedulam lecturum ac iuramentum inibi insertum prestiturum sub premissis protestationibus alias per eundem eodem die in diota domo capitulari in mea et eorundem testium presencia habitis et factis et non aliter neque alio<sup>5</sup> modo; et incontinens post premissa eandem schedulam perlegit et, ut in eadem continetur, iuravit. Super quibus assertione et protestatione per eundem modo premissa tunc ibidem factis me<sup>6</sup> unum vel plura publicum seu publica exinde conficere instrumentum sive instrumenta ac testes prescriptos testimonium perhibere etiam tunc ibidem rogavit et requisivit.

QUIBUS sic pactis die, mense et anno prediotis ac solempni consecratione eiusdem reverendissimi patris finita et expedita, idem reverendissimus pater dominus Thomas Cant' archiepiscopus ante dictum summum altare pallium recepturus in mea et dictorum Magistrorum Johannis Tregunwell, Thome Bedyll et Ricardi Gwent testium predictorum ad hoc specialiter adhibitorum presencia ante prestationem iuramenti infrascripti iterum protestatus est se huiusmodi sequens iuramentum sub eisdem protestationibus ut premittitur in diota domo capitulari habitis et factis ac superius descriptis et non aliter neque alio modo prestiturum et iuramenturum. Ac ibidem immediate post premissa iuramentum sub forma que sequitur:

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN.<sup>7</sup> Ego Thomas [as in the bull to the archbishop elect notifying him of the form of the oath of loyalty down to the words et hec sancta Dei evangelia]<sup>8</sup> prestitit et iuravit. Super qua protestatione sic ut premittitur per

eundem reverendissimum tertio facta et habita, idem  
 reverendissimus pater me prothonotarium et notarium publicum<sup>9</sup>  
 unum vel plura publicum seu publica instrumentum sive instrumenta  
 exinde conficere ac testes predictos testimonium perhibere de  
 et super eisdem etiam tertio rogavit et requisivit.

ACTA fuerunt hec omnia et singula prout suprascribuntur  
 et recitantur respective sub anno Domini indictione regni  
 Regis predicto, mense, die et locis predictis presentibus tunc  
 ibidem venerabilibus viris prenomatis testibus ad premissa  
 respective ut premittitur adhibitis et requisitis.

ET EGO Ricardus Watkyns in legibus bacalaurius dicti  
 domini nostri Regis prothonotarius, quia premissis<sup>10</sup> omnibus  
 et singulis dum sic, ut premittitur, sub anno Domini et regni  
 dicti domini nostri Regis, mense die et loco predictis agebantur  
 et fiebant una cum prenomatis testibus presens personaliter  
 interfui eaque omnia et singula sic fieri vidi et audiui ac in  
 notam sumpsi, ideo hoc presens publicum instrumentum manu  
 alterius (me interim aliter occupato) fideliter scriptum exinde  
 confeci publicavi atque in hanc publicam formam redegi, signo  
 que et nomine meis solitis signavi rogatus et requisitus in  
 fidem et testimonium omnium et singulorum premissorum.<sup>11</sup>

[<sup>1</sup> prestaturum in MS.

<sup>2</sup> This protestation is printed, with minor variations, in Strype, Cranmer, I, pp. 329-30.

<sup>3</sup> With all the words editorially reconstructed now legible and these variations: in antea for inantea; septimo for VII<sup>o</sup>, mihi for mihi, dampnum for damnum, eis interlined as a correction, consilio vel tractatu for consilio, facto vel tractatu, eandem Romanam Ecclesiam for Romanam Ecclesiam, quibuscumque for quibuscumque, quantotius for quantotius, dispositiones for dispensationes, aliquo modo for aliquomodo.

<sup>4</sup> The notarial sign<sup>o</sup> appears in the left hand margin before the

word manibus. It indicates the point in the text where the sense of the sentence, in which the oath of loyalty occurs, is continued.

<sup>5</sup> alio interlined as a correction.

<sup>6</sup> me omitted in MS.

<sup>7</sup> The sign "·" appears in the left hand margin opposite DEI.

<sup>8</sup> Fol. 5v. The folio begins with the words Non ero de consilio. This version of the oath of loyalty has all the words editorially reconstructed now legible and the following variations: Thomas archiepiscopus Cant' for THOMAS electus Cantuariensis, Romane Ecclesie et domino for Romane Ecclesie ac domino, Non ero de consilio for Non ero in consilio, seu capiantur mala captione for seu capiantur, aut in eos manus down to the word colore omitted, mihi for michi, aut nuncium for aut nuncios, dampnum for damnum, defendendum salvo meo ordine for defendendum, Iura down to the words persequar et impugnabo omitted, aut meum nuncium for aut per meum nuncium, mensam mei archiepiscopatus for mensam meam, aliquo modo for aliquomodo, etiam cum concensu capituli mee omitted. A version of the oath of loyalty is printed in Strype, Cranmer, I, p. 331. It is similar to the version recorded here with the following important difference: electus Cantuariensis for archiepiscopus Cant'.

<sup>9</sup> subscriptum interlined as a correction

<sup>10</sup> premissis interlined as a correction.

<sup>11</sup> The remainder of the folio is blank.]

COMMISSIONS AND LETTERS: THOMAS

GRANMER'S REGISTER FOLS 15 - 66

1[fol. 15]

Licence from 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et apostolice sedis legatus'<sup>1</sup> for life to Mary Guldeford, widow of Henry Guldeford, Kt, to have a private oratory anywhere within the province of Canterbury, provided that it be decent, for herself and her household to receive the Eucharist, matrimony, child baptism in a moveable font, and the purification of women after childbirth from a suitable chaplain, provided that nothing prejudicial be done to the local parish church. Lambeth, 13 Feb. 1534.

[<sup>1</sup>On 4 Nov. 1534, Cranmer appeared in Convocation and announced that his title was not to be apostolice sedis legatus, but metropolitanus. Cf. S.E. Lehmberg, The Reformation Parliament 1529-1536 (Cambridge, 1970), p. 214.]

2

[13 Feb. 1535. Licence to Margaret Grey, Marchioness of Dorset, to have a private oratory]

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et apostolice sedis legatus dilecte nobis in Christo Margarete marchionisse Dorsset relicte nuper prenobilis viri Thome marchionis Dorsset salutem, gratiam et benedictionem. DEVOTIONEM tuam, qua Deum et sancte Ecclesie sue sacramenta cupis humili spiritu venerari, plurimum in Domino commendantes et piis petitionibus tuis ex iustis causis animum nostrum moventibus annuere volentes ut in quacumque capella sive

oratorio infra domum seu manerium tuum, aut alterius cuiuscumque ad quod te divertere contigerit, nostre Cant' provincie ad hoc honeste constructum et decenter ornatum sacratissimum Eucharistie sacramentum, quamdiu ibidem residere te contigerit dummodo sub fideli et segura, sicut convenit, servetur custodia ne ad id manus prophana extendi possit temporibus debitis renovandum, cum debitis honore et reverencia habere et contemplari valeas; utque matrimonium quodcumque contractum sive contrahendum per te aut per alium quemcumque in domo tua sive alterius cuiuscumque ad quam te divertere contigerit nostre Cant' provincie pro tempore habitantes, temporibus a iure statutis triva que bannorum edicione precedente, solemnizari et celebrari necnon proles quascumque nascituras sive ex te sive alia quacumque pro tempore habitante in eiusmodi domo tua sive alterius ad quam te divertere contigerit nostre provincie in fonte baptismali non fixo sed removibili in loco congruo decenter erigendo et habendo baptizari, et te sive alias parturientes seu puerperas quascumque sic ut prefertur habitantes super partu huiusmodi purificari facere in eiusmodi capella sive oratorio quamdiu ibidem residere te contigerit per quemcumque capellanum idoneum libere possis et valeas, dummodo ecclesie parochiali infra quam domus sive manerium huiusmodi situatur nullum exinde generetur preiudicium, specialem tibi concedimus facultatem per presentes ad vitam tuam naturalem duraturas.

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus est appensum. DAT' in manerio nostro de Lambith xiii<sup>o</sup> die mensis Februarii anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo



quarto et nostre consecrationis anno secundo.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Properly 13 Feb., 1534? Cf. 1]

3[fol. 15-v.]

Licence for life from 'THOMAS. permissione divina Cant'  
archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitamus' to  
George Barnardiston Esq. of Ickwell Bury(Ikwelbury. Ickwelburye)  
in the parish of Northill(Northeell) in the diocese of  
Lincoln to have an oratory at the manor of Ickwell Bury,  
provided that it be decent, to receive the Eucharist,  
provided that nothing prejudicial be done to the local  
parish church. Lambeth, 20 May 1535.

4

[23 Nov. 1535. General notification that the prior and  
chapter of Christ Church Canterbury have granted to Richard  
Layton. Peter Lingham and Robert Jonson the next presentation  
to one of four churches in London. The churches are St  
Dionis Backohurch. All Hallows Lombard Street. St John the  
Evangelist Watling Street and St Mary Bothaw.]

OMNIBUS Christi fidelibus ad quos hoc presens scriptum  
pervenerit Thomas Dei paciencia prior ecclesie Christi Cant'  
et eiusdem loci conventus sive capitulum, veri et indubitati  
patroni ecclesiarum parochialium Sancti Dionisii, Omnium  
Sanctorum in le Lumbarde Streate, Sancti Johannis Evangeliste

in le Wattlyng Streate et Beate Marie Botolphi civitatis  
London', salutem in Domino.

SCIATIS nos priorem et conventum sive capitulum,  
patronos antedictos, in domo nostra capitulari die subscripto  
capitulariter congregatos et ad officium infrascriptum  
capitulum facientes unanimi concensu nostro<sup>1</sup> dedisse et  
concessisse atque hoc presenti scripto nostro pro nobis et<sup>2</sup>  
successoribus nostris confirmasse dilectis nobis in Christo  
Richardo Layton et Petro Lingham, clericis, ac Roberto  
Jonson, notorio publico, executoribusque et assignatis suis  
et cuiuslibet eorundem coniunctim et eorum cuilibet per se  
divisim et insolidum primam et proximam<sup>3</sup> dictarum ecclesiarum  
parochialium atque cuiuslibet earundem per se divisim et  
seperatim, de qua predictis Richardo, Petro et Roberto ac  
eorum et cuiuslibet eorundem executoribus et assignatis  
coniunctim ut prefertur et divisim ad eorum et cuiuslibet  
sive unius ipsorum arbitrium et voluntatem melius videbitur  
expediens, vacationem, presentationem, nominationem et liberam  
dispensationem iusque presentandi ad easdem et earum singulas  
sive unamquamque per se ut prefertur divisim et seperatim pro  
una et proxima vice tantum; ita quod bene liceat et licebit  
eisdem Richardo Layton et Petro Lingham et Roberto Jonson et  
cuilibet eorundem executoribusque et assignatis suis coniunctim  
ut prefertur et divisim quamcumque personam idoneam ad unam  
ipsarum ecclesiarum parochialium, de qua eis et eorum cuilibet  
ad proprium suum arbitrium et voluntatem visum fuerit magis  
utile et expediens cum dicte parochiales<sup>4</sup> ecclesie sive  
ipsarum una aut aliqua per resignationem, cessionem,

dimissionem, permutationem, mortem, privationem seu amotionem  
 aut quocumque alio modo iam primo et proximo vacaverint seu  
 vacare<sup>5</sup> contigerint, vacaverit sive vacare contigerit, pro  
 hac unica vice et proxima vacatione huiusmodi tantum, loci  
 illius ordinario et diocesano aut alio<sup>6</sup> quicumque potestatem,  
 iurisdictionem seu auctoritatem in ea parte quovismodo  
 habenti seu habituro libere et licite nominare et presentare,  
 ceteraque facere et expedire in tam amplis modo et forma  
 prout et quemadmodum nosmetipsi et successores nostri  
 faceremus seu facerent si hoc scriptum nostrum eis factum  
 non fuisset, donec et quoadusque predicta persona vigore  
 nominationis et presentationis huiusmodi in una ecclesia  
 prefatarum ecclesiarum parochialium, ad quam per predictos  
 Richardum, Petrum et Robertum sive eorum aut unius eorumdem  
 executores et assignatos coniunctim (ut premittitur) et divisim  
 modo predicto nominata et presentata extiterit, rite et  
 legitime instituta<sup>7</sup> ac realem, actualement et corporalem  
 possessionem eiusdem adepti<sup>8</sup> fuerit absque aliquali impetitione,  
 contradictione, impedimento seu perturbatione nobis<sup>9</sup> et  
 successorum nostrorum huiusmodi. PROVISIO semper quod postquam  
 presens scriptum nostrum iuxta eius formam superius recitatam  
 suum debitum consecutum fuerit effectum extunc dispositio  
 patronalis et ius presentandi huiusmodi ad nos et successores  
 nostros integre remaneant et revertantur in futurum cum  
 effectu, salva etiam nobis predictis priori et conventui sive  
 capitulo et successoribus nostris huiusmodi annua pensione  
 ex unaquaque ecclesiarum parochialium huiusmodi nobis ab  
 antiquo debita et consueta.<sup>10</sup>

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum commune  
presentibus apposuimus. Dat' in dicta<sup>11</sup> domo nostra  
capitulari xxxiii<sup>o</sup> die mensis Novembris anno Domini millesimo  
quingentesimo xxxv<sup>o</sup>.

[<sup>1</sup> nostris in MS.    <sup>2</sup> et omitted in MS.    <sup>3</sup> prima et proximaque  
in MS.    <sup>4</sup> parochie in MS.    <sup>5</sup> vacari in MS.    <sup>6</sup> alii in MS.  
<sup>7</sup> institutus in MS.    <sup>8</sup> adeptus in MS.    <sup>9</sup> nostris in MS.  
<sup>10</sup> consuetum in MS.    <sup>11</sup> diote in MS.]

5[fol. 16]

[6 Feb., 1538. Commission from the Crown to Richard Yngworth,  
suffragan bishop of Dover, to visit the houses of the  
Dominican, Franciscan, Carmelite, Austin and Crutched friars  
throughout England]<sup>1</sup>

HENRICUS octavus Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Rex,  
fidei defensor, Dominus Hibernie ac in terris supremum  
ecclesie Anglicane sub Christo caput DILECTO nobis Richardo,  
episcopo suffraganeo sive titulari Doveriensis, priori  
domus sive prioratus de<sup>2</sup> Langle Regis ordinis Sancti Dominici,<sup>3</sup>  
salutem.

Cum predilectus nobis Thomas Crumwell, preclari  
ordinis garterii miles, dominus Crumwell, consiliarius<sup>4</sup> noster,  
sigillique nostri privati custos et secretarius primarius<sup>5</sup>  
ac noster ad causas ecclesiasticas quascumque ad nos uti  
supremum caput diote ecclesie nostre anglicane spectantes et

pertinentes vicem gerens vicarius generalis et officialis  
 principalis, alias per litteras nostras patentes sigillo  
 nostro maiori munitas cum potestate substituendi et revocandi  
 sufficienter et legitime deputatus, te ad infrascripta omnia  
 et singula vice et <sup>6</sup> nomine nostris sub modo et forma inferius  
 descriptis exequendum substituerit et deputaverit, nos vero  
 substitutionem et deputationem huiusmodi ratam gratam  
 habentes ad visitandum tam in capite quam in membris domos,  
 prioratus, monasteria et loca quecumque fratrum predicatorum,  
 minorum, carmelitarum, fratrum ordinis Sancti Augustini,  
 necnon fratrum cruciferorum infra regnum nostrum Anglie  
 ubilibet existentes; deque statu, conditione eorundem in  
 spiritualibus et temporalibus, vitaeque moribus et conversatione  
 tam presidentium, gardianorum sive priorum eorundem quam  
 aliarum personarum in eisdem degentium sive commorantium  
 quarumcumque inquirendi, et illos qui rei et criminosi reperti  
 fuerint iuxta excessuum <sup>7</sup> suorum exegentiam etiam puniendi,  
 mulotandi <sup>8</sup> et si opus fuerit deponendi et ab officiis sive  
 administrationibus suis ad tempus suspendendi vel imperpetuum  
 amovendi et privandi, ... <sup>9</sup> priores sive gardianos et presidentes  
 loco illorum substituendi et surrogandi et eos sic amotos,  
 etiam ulterius si delicti qualitas <sup>10</sup> id exposcat graviore pena,  
 puniendi et cohercendi atque ad probatiores vivendi mores modis  
 omnibus quibus id melius et efficacius poteris reducendi;  
 contumaces autem et rebelles, si quos inveneris, per quecumque  
 iuris regni nostri remedia compescendi, iniunctionesque in ea  
 parte congruas et competentes vice et auctoritate nostris eis  
 indicendi et assignandi, <sup>11</sup> penasque convenientes in earum

violatores infligendi et irrogandi, iuramenta insuper tam  
 successionis quam etiam fidelitatis et obediencie nobis et  
 heredibus nostris prestandi et quecumque alia sacramenta  
 ...<sup>12</sup> huius regni nostri prestari requisita ab omnibus infra  
 loca predicta constitutis exegendi et recipiendi, professiones  
 et sponctiones eorum superinde factas etiam sub sigillis et  
 subscriptionibus eorundem vice et nomine nostris recipiendi  
 et stipulandi, ac generaliter omnia alia et singula faciendi  
 et<sup>13</sup> exequendi que circa huiusmodi visitationis inquestum  
 seu reformationis negotia necessaria fuerint seu quomodolibet  
 oportuna, tibi de cuius eminenti<sup>14</sup> doctrina, morumque consilii  
 gravitate, ac in rebus gerendis fide et industria plurimum  
 confidimus vices nostras committimus ac plenam tenore presentium  
 concedimus facultatem cum cuiuslibet congrue et legitime  
 coercionis potestate; inhibentes ...<sup>15</sup> et provincialibus,  
 magistris, gardianis sive aliis officiariis dictorum ordinum  
 quibuscumque, quocumque nomine censeantur, ne ipsi aut eorum  
 aliquis quicquam in preiudicium visitationis huiusmodi  
 quovismodo attemptent sub pena contemptus; eo non obstante  
 quod de eorundem commissionibus a nobis aut nostra auctoritate  
 illis sive illorum aliquibus respective concessis specialis  
 mentio facta<sup>16</sup> non sit, et aliis in contrarium facientibus  
 non obstantibus quibuscumque; mandantes omnibus et singulis  
 vicecomitibus,<sup>17</sup> maioribus, bellivis ac quibuscumque aliis  
 officiariis ministris et subditis nostris quatenus tibi in  
 et<sup>18</sup> circa premissorum executionem effectualiter assistant et  
 suffragentur.

IN QUORUM premissorum fidem et testimonium presentes

litteras nostras in fieri et sigilli nostri quo ad causas  
utimur ecclesiasticas appensione communiri mandavimus.

DAT' sexto die mensis Februarii anno Domini  
millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo<sup>19</sup> septimo et regni nostri  
vicesimo nono.

- [<sup>1</sup>The commission is printed, with minor variations, in  
Wilkins, Concilia, III, pp. 829-30. <sup>2</sup>de omitted in MS.  
<sup>3</sup>Dominice in MS. <sup>4</sup>consiliarus in MS. <sup>5</sup>primarius in MS.  
<sup>6</sup>et omitted in MS. <sup>7</sup>excessum in MS.: meaning unclear.  
<sup>8</sup>mutandi in MS. <sup>9</sup>Nos vosque in MS.: meaning unclear.  
<sup>10</sup>sidelicti qualitos in MS. <sup>11</sup>assignandi in MS.  
<sup>12</sup>existatus in MS.: meaning unclear. <sup>13</sup>et omitted in MS.  
<sup>14</sup>eminente in MS. <sup>15</sup>provincialis in MS.: meaning unclear.  
<sup>16</sup>Corrected in MS. from fata. <sup>17</sup>vice commentibus in MS.  
<sup>18</sup>et omitted in MS. <sup>19</sup>trigesimo in MS.]

6[fol. 16-v.]

[5 May. 1538. Commission from the Crown to Richard Ingworth,  
suffragan bishop of Dover, to sequester the common seals and  
goods of the friars during his visitation and to draw up  
inventories of their possessions]<sup>1</sup>

HENRICUS octavus[etc.] dilecto nobis Ricardo episcopo  
suffraganeo Dover', salutem.

Cum nos alias litteras commissionales sigillo nostro  
ad causas ecclesiasticas roboratas ad visitandum tam in capite  
quam in membris omnes et singulos conventus fratrum cuiuscumque



ordinis per regnum nostrum Anglie ubilibet constitutos<sup>2</sup> tibi direxerimus et commisserimus, tuque earundem vigore visitationem nostram huiusmodi debite inchoaveris, nonnulli, uti fidedigna relatione accepimus, presidentes et fratres conventuum huiusmodi pendente visitatione nostra prelibata quam plurima bona tam mobilia quam imobilia localiaque, res et ornamenta domorum suarum profuse et insolenter dilipidarunt, vendiderunt et alienarunt[fol. 16v.]. Nos vero eorum iniquis conatibus oportuno remedio, antequam ulterius proserpat malum, occurrere volentes, ad exigendum et recipiendum sigilla communia sive conventualia quorumcumque locorum huiusmodi ad que pro visitatione nostra huiusmodi celebranda hactenus accesseris seu imposterum divertere te contigerit, eaque necnon bona tam mobilia quam imobilia localiaque, res et ornamenta locorum eorundem sequestrandum atque sub arcto et tuto sequestro ac salva custodia retinendum et conservandum ac sic retineri et conservari faciendum, inventariaque plena, vera et iusta et utrinque tam a te ipso quam a partibus indentata conficiendum et conscribendum, ceteraque omnia et singula que in ea parte necessaria fuerint seu quomodolibet oportuna faciendum et exequendum, tibi tenore presentium vices nostras committimus ac plenam tenore presentium concedimus facultatem, mandantes omnibus et singulis maioribus vicecomitibus ballivis aliisque ministris et officiariis nostris quibuscumque quatenus tibi in et circa premissorum executionem effectualiter assistant et suffragentur.

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum ad causas ecclesiasticas presentibus apponi mandavimus.



DAT' quinto die Maii, anno Domini millesimo  
quingentesimo tricesimo octavo et regni nostri tricesimo.

[<sup>1</sup>The commission is printed, with minor variations, in Wilkins,  
Concilia, III, p. 835. <sup>2</sup>constitutis in MS.]

# I

[Acta concerning the publication of the above commissions]

DIE VENERIS videlicet duodecimo die Julii anno 1538 et  
regni illustrissimi domini nostri Regis Henrici octavi anno  
tricesimo subtus imagine crucifixi ex porte boriali in ecclesia  
cathedrali domini Pauli London', coram venerabili viro Magistro  
Johanne Cookes, legum doctore, officiale principale etc.  
reverendissimi Thome Cantur' archiepiscopi etc. iudicialiter  
sedenti, in presencio mei Anthonii Huse, notarii publici,  
registrarii principalis etc. ac testium inferius nominatorum,  
comparuit reverendus pater dominus Richardus, episcopus  
suffraganeus Dovoricensis,<sup>1</sup> et presentavit domino binas litteras  
commissionales regias sub sigillo ad causas ecclesiasticas  
sigillatas, quas dixit se non habere duplicatas. Quare petiit  
eas exemplari, decerni et fidem non minorem adhibendam eisdem  
decretis in quam litteris ipsis originalibus. Quas dictus  
officialis ad eius petitionem decrevit publicandas per me  
notorium qui supra etc. prout moris est in huiusmodi instrumentis  
etc. Presentibus tunc et ibidem Joanne Lewis, notario publico,  
et Willelmo Cookes litteris testibus<sup>2</sup> etc.

[<sup>1</sup>Dovorensis in MS.      <sup>2</sup>litteras testibus in MS.]

8

Licence to George Monour, alderman of London, and to Thomas his son and heir, granted 'cum expresse concensu et assensu dilecti filii nostri Richardi Withipoll, vicarii dicte ecclesie parochialis de Walthamstow moderni, premisso pro se specialiter adhibito', to have a private oratory in their home at Moons(Moones) in the parish of Walthamstow(Walthamstow), London diocese, provided that it be decent, in order that they, Thomas' wife, kinsmen staying with them and two servants may receive the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist and that Thomas' wife may receive purification after childbirth from a suitable priest, provided that nothing prejudicial be done to the parish church. Lambeth, 24 July 1537.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>For the site of Monour's house, cf. The Victoria History of the Counties of England: A History of the County of Essex, vol. VI, edited by W.R. Powell(Oxford, 1973), p. 242.]

2[fol. 17]

Licence from 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus per illustrissimum et investissimum in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum Henricum octavum Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Regem, fidei

defensorem et Dominum Hibernie ac supremum ecclesie Anglicane  
sub Christo caput ad infrascripta sufficienter et legitime  
deputatus to Katherine Dawbeney, lady of Daubeney (Dawbeney),  
 to have a private oratory wherever she may stay within the  
 province of Canterbury, provided that it be decent, in order  
 that she, her sons and her household may enjoy the sacraments  
 of penance and the Eucharist from a chaplain, provided that  
 nothing prejudicial be done to any parish church. Lambeth,  
 16 May 1538.

10

[28...1538. Commission to Christopher Nevinson as commissary  
general in the city and diocese of Canterbury]

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus,  
 totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus ad infrascripta per  
 illustrissimum et invictissimum in Christo principem et  
 dominum nostrum dominum Henricum octavum Dei gracia Anglie et  
 Francie Regem, fidei defensorem, Dominum Hibernie et in terra  
 supremum caput Anglicane<sup>1</sup> ecclesie sufficienter auctorizatus  
 DILECTO nobis in Christo Magistro Christofero Levinson, legum  
 doctore, salutem, gratiam et benedictionem.

Ad cognoscendum, procedendum et diffiniendum in  
 omnibus et singulis causis beneficialibus, matrimonialibus et  
 divorceiatoriis etiam nullitatis matrimonii nec non in omnibus

aliis causis et negotiis ecclesiasticis quibuscumque inter seu contra quoscumque subditos dicti domini nostri Regis nostrarum civitatis et diocesis Cant' qualitercumque motis seu movendis aut in consistorio nostro Cant' indecisis pendentibus easque et ea fine debito terminandum et finiendum; necnon ad inquirendum insuper corrigendum, puniendum et debite<sup>2</sup> castigandum crimina, reatus, excessus et defectus quorumcumque subditorum prefati domini nostri Regis infra civitatem et diocesim nostras commorantium sive delinquentium quorum<sup>3</sup> correctio, punitio et castigatio de iure ad nos et nostram iurisdictionem ordinariam<sup>4</sup> pertinere dinoscuntur ac pro huiusmodi criminibus, reatibus,<sup>5</sup> defectibus et excessibus<sup>6</sup> penas et penitencias salutes et legitimas infligendum et iniungendum easque in pietatis opera pro tuo sano arbitrio,<sup>7</sup> super quo tuam coram Altissimo Iudice conscientiam<sup>8</sup> onerans, commutandum; ad insinuandum preterea ac<sup>9</sup> probandum et testamenta et ultimas voluntates quarumcunque personarum diotarum civitatis et diocesis bona, iura sive credita notabilia in diversis diocesibus seu peculiaribus iurisdictionibus nostre provincie Cant' vite et mortis suarum tempore non habentium ac<sup>9</sup> approbandum, probationesque legitimas de et super eisdem recipiendum et admittendum administrationesque bonorum personarum sic uti premittitur qualificatorum, etiam ab intestato decedentium, illi vel illis cui vel quibus de iure committenda, ac bona et debita huiusmodi auctoritate nostra ordinaria si et quatenus oporteat in casibus<sup>10</sup> a iure premissis sequestrandum sequestrique huiusmodi custodiam iuxta iuris exigentiam committendum illudque quotiens et quando tibi videbitur revocandum, ac computus, calculus sive ratiocinium administrationis

aliis causis et negotiis ecclesiasticis quibuscumque inter seu contra quoscumque subditos dicti domini nostri Regis nostrarum civitatis et diocesis Cant' qualitercumque motis seu movendis aut in consistorio nostro Cant' indecisis pendentibus easque et ea fine debito terminandum et finiendum; necnon ad inquirendum insuper corrigendum, puniendum et debite<sup>2</sup> castigandum crimina, reatus, excessus et defectus quorumcumque subditorum prefati domini nostri Regis infra civitatem et diocesim nostras commorantium sive delinquentium quorum<sup>3</sup> correctio, punitio et castigatio de iure ad nos et nostram iurisdictionem ordinariam<sup>4</sup> pertinere dinoscuntur ac pro huiusmodi criminibus, reatibus,<sup>5</sup> defectibus et excessibus<sup>6</sup> penas et penitencias salutes et legitimas infligendum et iniungendum easque in pietatis opera pro tuo sano arbitrio,<sup>7</sup> super quo tuam coram Altissimo Iudice conscientiam<sup>8</sup> onerans, commutandum; ad insinuandum preterea ac<sup>9</sup> probandum et testamenta et ultimas voluntates quarumcumque personarum diotarum civitatis et diocesis bona, iura sive credita notabilia in diversis diocesibus seu peculiaribus iurisdictionibus nostre provincie Cant' vite et mortis suarum tempore non habentium ac<sup>9</sup> approbandum, probationesque legitimas de et super eisdem recipiendum et admittendum administrationesque bonorum personarum sic uti premittitur qualificatorum, etiam ab intestato decedentium, illi vel illis cui vel quibus de iure committenda, ac bona et debita huiusmodi auctoritate nostra ordinaria si et quatenus oporteat in casibus<sup>10</sup> a iure premissis sequestrandum sequestrique huiusmodi custodiam iuxta iuris exigentiam committendum illudque quotiens et quando tibi videbitur revocandum, ac compotum, calculum sive ratiocinium administrationis

bonorum huiusmodi recipiendum et audiendum executoresque et administratores bonorum huiusmodi dimittendum ab omni compoto, calculo sive ratiocinio prout iuris et equitatis fuerit; archidiaconoque Cant' et eius officiali ac aliis quibuscumque qui nostram ordinariam iurisdictionem violare, perturbare, impugnare seu impedire presumant inhibendum inhiberive<sup>11</sup> faciendum ac per censuras ecclesiasticas et alia legitima iuris remedia cohercendum et compellendum; ad inducendum quoque seu induci faciendum quoscumque clericos beneficiatos per nos ad quocumque beneficia ecclesiastica infra nostram diocesim imposterum admittendos et instituendos, quorum inductio<sup>12</sup> ad commissarium nostrum retroactis<sup>13</sup> temporibus de stilo, more et consuetudine pertinere hactenus iuxta morem et tenorem registri nostri usitatis et observatis consuevit, ipsosque sic per te in realem et corporalem possessionem beneficiorum huiusmodi inducendos per legitimas iurisdictiones iuxta et secundum mandata nostra tibi imposterum in hac parte dirigenda tuendum et defendendum; necnon ad faciendum, exeroendum et expediendum omnia alia et singula que ad cognitionem et officium commissarii nostri generalis civitatis et diocesis nostrarum Cant' de iure et consuetudine hactenus usitatis spectare et pertinere noscuntur, et que in premissis aut circa ea necessaria fuerint vel etiam oportuna; quoscumque etiam clericos coram quibuscumque iudiciis seu iusticiariis secularibus domini nostri Regis in causa sanguinis<sup>14</sup> vel super furto aut feloniam quacumque in dictis civitate et diocese<sup>15</sup> nostris Cant' indictatos, impetitos sive convictos vendicandum, exigendum, petendum et recipiendum ac huiusmodi

clericis omnibus et singulis de et super furto seu feloniam  
 (uti premititur) convictis<sup>16</sup> purgationes legitimas rite et  
 canonice indicendum, ipsasque taliter indictas prout casus et  
 iuris ratio et non aliter exegerit admittendum ac purgatos  
 huiusmodi iuxta immunitatem ecclesiasticam talibus clericis  
 vel ordini clericali hactenus indultam et concessam ab ipsis  
 criminibus immunes et innocentes quatenus leges et statuta  
 huius regni Anglie sinunt et permittunt declarandum sicque a  
 vinculis et caceribus prout moris et iuris est quotiens  
 opus fuerit relaxandum atque liberandum, tibi vices nostras  
 tenore presentium cum cuiuslibet cohercionis legitime potestate  
 committimus teque commissarium nostrum in et per totas  
 civitatem et diocesim nostras Cant' predictas unacum presentibus  
 nostris litteris commissionalibus ad nostrum beneplacitum  
 duntaxat duraturas cum<sup>17</sup> omnibus feodis, emolumentis et  
 proficuis commissario nostro debitis et consuetis preficimus,  
 ordinamus et presentium serie constituimus.

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus  
 apponi fecimus. DAT' in palatio nostro Cant' vicesimo octavo  
 die mensis<sup>18</sup> anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo  
 octavo et nostre consecrationis anno sexto.

[<sup>1</sup>Anglica in MS.      <sup>2</sup>debito in MS.      <sup>3</sup>quorum added as a  
 correction in MS.      <sup>4</sup>ordina[fol. 17v.]riam in MS.  
<sup>5</sup>Corrected in MS. from reatubus.      <sup>6</sup>Corrected in MS. from  
excessibus.      <sup>7</sup>arbitrue in MS.      <sup>8</sup>conscientium in MS.  
<sup>9</sup>eo omitted in MS.      <sup>10</sup>casibus in MS.      <sup>11</sup>in hiberi in MS.  
<sup>12</sup>inductio omitted in MS.      <sup>13</sup>retroactus in MS.      <sup>14</sup>in  
consanguinis in MS.      <sup>15</sup>diocesis in MS.      <sup>16</sup>convictos in MS.  
<sup>17</sup>cum omitted in MS.      <sup>18</sup>The month is omitted in MS.]



11[fol. 18]

[20 May, 1541. Mandate to the dean of the Arches, ordering the execution of a writ]

THOMAS etc. dilecto nobis in Christo decano decanatus nostri de archibus London' nostre et ecclesie nostre Christi Cant' iurisdictionis immediate seu eius commissario vel deputato, salutem.

Breve etc. Nos quatenus indilate post receptionem presentium dictum decretum cuius varia exemplaria in papiro impressa<sup>1</sup> unacum presentibus vobis per latorem presentium transmittimus in omnibus et singulis ecclesiis collegiatis, parochialibus et capellis ceterisque quibuscumque infra decanatum et iurisdictionem predictos ubilibet constitutis ab omnibus et singulis collegiorum magistris, ecclesiarum parochialium rectoribus, vicariis, curatis et plebanis in eisdem ecclesiis et capellis ministrantibus diebus dominicis sive festivis etc. uti in priori exemplari continetur. Et quid etc. Dat' 20 Maii 1541.

[<sup>1</sup>inpressa in MS.]

12

[18 Feb. 1542. Licence for Robert Peterson, dean of South Malling, to be absent for two years on account of ill health]

THOMAS etc. dilecto nobis in Christo Magistro Roberto



Peterson decano ecclesie nostre collegiate de Sowthmallling nostre  
et ecclesie nostre Christi Cantuariensis iurisdictionis  
immediate, salutem, gratiam et benedictionem.

Expositis nobis pro parte tua precibus favorabiliter  
inclinati ac incolumitati corporis sui prospicere volentes,  
tecum pro bona valetudine<sup>1</sup> tua adipiscenda et tuenda ut ab  
eodem collegio tue absentare et in quocunque alio loco  
aeris salubrioris tuo arbitratu eligendo conversari et  
commorari per bienium a festo annunciationis Beate Marie  
Virginis post datum presentium litterarumstrarum numerandum  
et computandum, preter<sup>2</sup> unum mensem in quolibet quarterio  
anni continuis<sup>3</sup> vel interpellatis diebus etiam numerandum,  
libere et licite valeas et possis tenore presentium indulgemus,  
teque ad habitandum et larem tuum fovendum in quocunque alio  
tuo beneficio vel loco uti premittitur designando durante  
bienio predicto ac sub modo et forma premissis, quoad  
poterimus, tolleramus, iuramento collationis eiusdem collegii a  
te de continuo et personaliter residendo et personalem tuam  
residentiam ibidem continuo faciendo nobis prestito, ceterisque  
dicti collegii statutis et ordinationibus in contrarium editis  
...<sup>4</sup> bienium huiusmodi non obstantibus quibuscunque, proviso  
tamen quod in tua absentia cetera onera eiusdem collegii tue  
cure<sup>5</sup> incumbencia debite supportentur.

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus  
est appensum. Dat' in manerio nostro de Lambeth xviii<sup>o</sup> die  
mensis Februarii anno Domini 1541 etc.<sup>6</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>valetudine in MS.      <sup>2</sup>preterquam in MS.]

<sup>3</sup>continus in MS.      <sup>4</sup>que ad in MS.; properly quoad?  
<sup>5</sup>iure in MS.      <sup>6</sup>Cf. 16.]

13[fol. 18-v.]

[15 Oct., 1541. Mandate to M. Richard Lyell, LL.D., dean of  
 Shoreham, Croydon, Bocking, Risborough, Tarring and Pagham,  
 reciting letters missive from the King and Council, dated 4 Oct.  
 The archbishop demands the complete removal of all shrines and  
 monuments within the deaneries and the publication of the  
 royal Injunctions]

THOMAS[etc.] DILECTO nobis in Christo Magistro  
 Richardo Lyell, legum doctori, decano decanatum de Shoreham,  
 Croydon, Bocking, Risburghe, Terringe et Pageham ecclesie  
 Christi Cant' iurisdictionis immediate seu eius in hac parte  
 deputato salutem, gratiam et benedictionem.

LITTERAS missivas dioti metuendissimi domini nostri  
 Regis signatas et nominibus dominorum consiliariorum<sup>1</sup> suorum in  
 calce earundem subscriptas,<sup>2</sup> signeto suo obsignatas, nobis  
 inscriptas et datas, nuper debitis cum honore et reverentia  
 accepimus, tenorem sequentem complectentes:

MOSTE<sup>3</sup> reverend father in God, right trustye and  
 right entierly welbeloved we grete you well. Lettyng yow wit  
 that whereas heretofore uppon the seale and remembraunce which  
 we had to ovr bonden duety towards Allmayghty God, perceyving  
 sondry supersticions and abuses to be used and embraced by ovr  
 people, whereby they grevously offended Him and His worde, we

did not onely cause the ymages and bones of suche as they  
resorted and offeryd unto, whith the ornamentes of the same,  
and all suche wrytinges and monumentes of fayned myrales  
wherwyth they werr ylluded, to be taken awaye in all places  
of our realme; but also by our iniunctions commanded that  
noe offering or setting of lyght or candelles shold be  
sufferyd in any churche[fol. 18v.] but onely to the blisshed  
sacrament of the altare;<sup>4</sup> it is lately come to our knowledge  
that this our good entent and purpose notwithstanding, the  
shrynes, coverynges of shrynes and monumentes of those thinges  
doe yet remayne in sondrye places of our realme, moche to the  
slaunder of our doinges and to the greate displeasure of  
Almyghty God, the same beng meanes to allure our subiectes to  
ther formar hypocrytes and supersticion, and also that our  
iniunctyons be not kepte as apperteneth. For<sup>5</sup> the due and  
spedy reformacyon whereof we have thought mete by these<sup>6</sup> our  
letters expressely to wyll and commaunde yow that inco[n]tynently  
upon the receipt hereof yow shall not onely cause due searche to  
be made in your cathedrall churche for those thinges, and if  
any shryne, covering of shryne, table, monument of myrales or  
other pilgrimage do there contynue to cause hit to be taken a  
waye so as there remayne noe memorye of it, but also that you  
shall take order wythe all the curates and other havyng  
chardge wyth in your diocese to do the semblable and to se that  
your iniunctyons be duely kept as appertenethe without faylyng,  
as we truste you and as yow well answer for the contrary.

Even under<sup>7</sup> our signet at our towne of Hull the  
iiii<sup>th</sup> daye of October in the xxxiii<sup>rd</sup> yere ofoure reigne.<sup>8</sup>

In capite vero earundem sic scriptum est: By the Kynges. In  
 calce hec nomina habentur: William Southampton, Robert Sussex,  
 J. Russell, Cutbert Danelmensis, Anthony Browne, Anthony  
 Winkfyld, John Gage. Inscriptio hec est: To the moste reverend  
 father in God our ryght trusty and ryght entierly welbeloved  
 counsailor the archebyssshoppe of Canturbury and our trustye and  
 welbelovyd his vicar generall and the deane of the cathedrall  
 churche of the same.

NOS VERO, affectantes ex animo eiusdem domini  
 nostri Regis litteris et mandatis obtemperare, volentesque, pro  
 nostro erga suam regiam celsitudinem officio, nobis demandatis  
 negotiis omnem nostram curam et solertem adhibere diligentiam,  
 vobis pro parte sue regie maiestatis tenore presentium mandamus  
 et precipiendo iniungimus quatenus receptis presentibus, cum omni  
 qua poteritis celeritate et matura diligencia omnes et singulos  
 ecclesiarum collegiarum<sup>9</sup> magistros, ecclesiarum parochialium  
 rectores, vicarios et presbiteros quoscumque infra decanatus  
 predictos degentes coram vobis diebus et locis pro vestro sano  
 arbitratu quam citissime tamen fieri possit assignandis convocari  
 possitis; eisque coram vobis constitutis contenta et comprehensa  
 in litteris predictis pro parte sue regie maiestatis denunciatis,  
 declaretis, exponatis<sup>10</sup> et delucidetis ac parte demonstretis,  
 eaque et contenta quecumque in dictis litteris neonon et  
 iniunctiones alias a sua maiestate clero et plebi suo editas et  
 promulgatas<sup>11</sup> ab omnibus et singulis subditis suis infra nostros  
 decanatus predictos degentibus firmiter et exacte atque ad  
 unguem observari et debite executioni<sup>12</sup> demandari curetis et  
 efficaciter absque ullo fuco fieri causetis prout eidem domino

nostro Regi sub vestro periculo respondere volueritis. ET  
 QUID in premissis feceritis nos citra ultimum diem mensis  
 Novembris proximi futuri per litteras vestras autentice  
 sigillatas reddatis certiores.

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus  
 est appensum. DAT' in manerio nostro de Lambeth decimo  
 quinto die mensis Octobris et anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo  
 quadragesimo primo et nostre consecrationis anno nono.<sup>13</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Corrected in MS. from consiliorum. <sup>2</sup>Corrected in MS. from  
suscriptas. <sup>3</sup>The sign "•" appears in the left hand margin  
 against MOSTE. <sup>4</sup>The demand was embodied in the Royal  
 Injunctions of 1538; cf. 92B. <sup>5</sup>Pro in MS. <sup>6</sup>those in MS.  
<sup>7</sup>under omitted in MS. <sup>8</sup>xviii<sup>th</sup> year of oure reigne in MS.  
<sup>9</sup>collegiatorum in MS. <sup>10</sup>exponetis in MS. <sup>11</sup>Both sets of  
 Royal Injunctions are printed in Gee and Hardy, op. cit., pp.  
 269-81. The Injunctions of 1536 are recorded in G.R., fols 97-9.  
<sup>12</sup>executionis in MS. <sup>13</sup>The mandate is printed in P.S., Cranmer  
II, pp. 490-1, with this important variation: our Injunctions  
be duely kept for your Injunctions be duely kept.]

14[fols 18v.-19]

[29 Oct. 1541. Certificate of execution concerning the same from  
archdeacon of Canterbury]

REVERENDISSIMO in Christo patri et domino domino  
 Thome permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopo, totius Anglie  
 primate et metropolitano, vester humilis Edmundus Cranmere  
 archidiaconus vester Cant' animodas reverenciam et obedienciam

tanto reverendissimo patri debitas cum honore.

Litteras vestras mandatarias sive commissionales nuper cum ea qua decuit reverencia recipimus sub his verbis THOMAS etc. cuius datum erat in manerio vestro de Lambhith xv<sup>to</sup> die instantis mensis Octobris. Quarum quidem<sup>1</sup> litterarum vigore pariter et auctoritate, convocatis coram nobis universo clero vestre Cant<sup>e</sup> diocesis et eiisdem coram nobis certis die et loco iam effluxis comparentibus, denunciavimus, declaravimus, exposuimus, apertaque demonstratione declaravimus tenorem, seriem et effectum litterarum missivarum illustrissimi domini<sup>2</sup> nostri Regis vestre paternitati directarum et datarum, quarum tenor in dictis litteris vestris commissionalibus est insertus et contentus. Necnon eiisdem ex parte illustrissime regie maiestatis firmiter iniungendo mandamus quod unus quisque iuxta fidelitatis vinculum erga regiam celsitudinem debite et requisite perimplerent, exacteque et ad unguem observarent debiteque executioni absque ullo fuco demandari curarent tam omnia et singula contenta in dictis litteris missivis quam iniunctionibus suis regiis alias [fol. 19] per<sup>3</sup> suam regiam maiestatem eiisdem clero et populo observandis datis et ministratis.

IN cuius rei testimonium sigillum officii nostri presentibus apposuimus. Dat' xxix<sup>o</sup> die mensis Octobris anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo quadragésimo primo.

[<sup>1</sup>quid in MS.      <sup>2</sup>illustrissimo domini in MS; domini corrected from domino.      <sup>3</sup>per [fol. 19] per in MS.]

15

The like from Hugh Glasyer, STB, commissary general in the town and marches of Calais(Calisie), who recited the letters missive on 14 Nov. 1541 in a synod held in the parish church of St Peter in the suburbs of Calais before all rectors, or proctors in their absence, and the priests who live within the town and marches, declaring that he himself would act in accordance with their contents. During his ordinary visitation celebrated in November 1541 in all the parishes of the town and marches, he recited the letters before each rector, or proctor in his absence, priest, churchwarden and parishoner lawfully summoned before him. Sealed with the seal of the commissaryship of Calais, 24 Nov. 1541(34 Henry VIII).<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Whilst the date of the mandate appears by the year of the Incarnation as 1541, the regnal year is incorrectly given as 34 Henry VIII, repeating the error of 13]

16[fol. 19]

Licence to M. Robert Peterson, dean of South Malling(Sowthmallyng) to be absent from the college at the archbishop's pleasure on account of ill health, provided that his duties are duly fulfilled in his absence. Lambeth, 31 March 1542.

[Cf. 12]



17[fol. 19v.]

Royal writ de inquirendo in the name of 'HENRICUS OCTAVUS Dei gracia Anglie, Francie et Hibernie Rex, fidei defensor ac in terra supremum caput Anglicane et Hibernice ecclesie'<sup>1</sup> concerning Thomas Bocher, butcher, recently of Buxted(Buxstede) who was found guilty on several charges of felony at a gaol delivery held at East Grinstead(Est Grenested, Est Grenestede) on the last Monday before the feast of St Mary Magdalene [18 July, 1541] before Thomas Willughby(also Willoubiy), Kt, justice of the assize in Sussex, and Humphrey Broun, serjeant-at-law and justice of the assize. Bocher asserted that he was a clerk and claimed benefit of clergy. Anthony Browne, acting on behalf of the court, alleged that on 10 July, 26 Henry VIII [1534] at Uckfield(Tuckfelde), Bocher married Maud Hollywell, widow, in the parish church and that he has known her carnally. Browne asserted that Bocher was a bigamist, which Bocher denied. Since such matters pertain ad forum ecclesiasticum, the archbishop is to enquire whether Bocher is a bigamist or not and to inform the justices of his findings and to return the writ at the next general gaol delivery in Sussex. [Teste]: Thomas Willughby at East Grinstead, 18 July 33 Henry VIII[1541].

[<sup>1</sup>In June 1541, the Irish Parliament passed an Act 'for the King's title'; in effect, this changed the King's style from Lord to King of Ireland. In England, this change was formally accomplished by Royal Proclamation, dated 23 January 1542, and by Parliamentary statute in 1544. Cf. B. Bradshaw, 'The Beginnings of Modern Ireland' in The Irish Parliamentary Tradition, edited by B. Farrell(Dublin, 1973), pp. 75-8; Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations, I, pp. 307-8; Stat. Realm, III, pp. 958



-9. The Act of Supremacy was passed by Parliament in Dublin in 1536, but the title 'supremum caput Hibernice ecclesie' did not become a regular part of the royal style until 1541. Cf. S.E. Lehmberg, The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII 1536-47 (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 36-7.]

18A [fols 19v.-20]

Signification to the Crown of the results of the archbishop's investigation. Since there is no place nor parish called Uokfield within his diocese or jurisdiction in Sussex, the archbishop is unable to ascertain whether Bocher is a bigamist or not. Lambeth, 1 March 1542.

18B

Alternative version of the above. Since there is no place nor parish called Uokfield within his diocese or jurisdiction in Sussex, the archbishop cannot ascertain whether Bocher is a bigamist or not. Lambeth, 1 March 1542.

[Cf. 60A-C]

19

Royal writ ordering the archbishop upon receipt to publish a writ, drawn up with the advice of the council, in all cathedrals, collegiate and parish churches, chapels and elsewhere within his diocese and jurisdiction, copies of which are to be supplied

by the messenger. Following the recital of the writ, the archbishop is to ensure that it is affixed to the doors of each church. Westminster, 7 May 33 Henry VIII[1541]

20[fol. 20-v.]

Commission to M. John Cookes, LL.D., vicar general, to proceed in a dispute concerning the will of Cathbert Beacher, clothier and citizen of London. It is asserted that before his death, Beacher made a will in which he nominated certain people to be his executors. At the time of his death, he possessed bona, iura et credita in several dioceses of the province. Since the power to grant probate belongs to the archbishop alone, Cookes is to enquire into the validity of the will. If it be valid, he is authorized to grant probate. Should it be established that Beacher died intestate, he is to commit administration to those who may lawfully perform the same and to do all else necessary with the same authority that the archbishop himself possesses[Undated].

21

Licence to Leticia Rise, widow, Richard Wilson and to Ralph Caldwell, gent., executors of the will of Simon Rise (Rice) late lord of the manor of Blakesware(Blakis Ware) within the parish of Ware, diocese of London. They may have a private oratory, provided that it be decent, to enjoy the sacraments of the Eucharist and of penance from a priest and

also to hear the canonical hours, provided that nothing prejudicial be done to the parish church of Ware. The licence is to be valid for the three petitioners, whichever of them may live the longest, their children and the members of their household. Lambeth, 26 Feb. 1541.

[The remainder of the folio is blank]

22[fol. 21]

Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury[in the same terms as 13].<sup>1</sup>  
The archbishop orders the archdeacon to assemble all the masters of collegiate churches, the rectors and vicars of all parish churches and all priests within the diocese as soon as possible and to recite the contents of the royal mandate and to enjoin obedience to the royal Injunctions by all the King's subjects within the diocese. The archdeacon is to inform the archbishop of his actions before 30 Nov. Lambeth, 15 Oct. 1541.

[<sup>1</sup>The following important variations occur: 'our Injunctions be duly kept' for 'your Injunctions be duly kept' and the regnal year still given incorrectly as 'the xxxiiii<sup>th</sup> yere of our reigne'.]

23[fol. 21v.]

Royal writ[in the same terms as 19]. Westminster, 28 July 33 Henry VIII[1541].

24

[1 May, 1540. Citation to the master or warden and fellows of the college of Higham Ferrers to assemble for the archbishop's visitation]

THOMAS etc. dilectis nobis in Christo magistro sive custodi ac sociis collegii Beate Marie ac Sancti Edwardi Confessoris de Higham Ferrers Lincoln' diocesis nostre foundationis, salutem, gratiam et benedictionem.

Pastoris providentia circa curam sibi commissam ita tenetur intendere ut bona piorum locorum, que ad certum usum largitione fidelium sunt destinata, ad illum debeant et non alium absque auctoritate sufficienti converti. Et quia nos, divina favente clemencia, in persona nostra aut per commissarium nostrum die Jovis videlicet xlii<sup>o</sup> die presentis mensis Maii dictum collegium tam in capite quam in membris ad honorem Dei et animarum salutem ac dicti collegii utilitatem, Deo dante, proponimus legitime visitare et defectus quoscunque inibi repertos correctionem et reformationem necessarias<sup>1</sup> indigentes corrigere et in statum debitum pro viribus reformare, vos igitur omnes et singulos tenore presentium peremptorie citamus quod compareatis, et vestrum quilibet personaliter, coram nobis aut nostro in hac parte commissario in capella infra dictum collegium situata dicto die Jovis [blank] die<sup>2</sup> mensis Maii, cum continuatione et prorogatione dierum extunc sequentium ut convenit, more solito congregatim huiusmodi nostre visitationis officium humiliter subituri et eidem plenarie prout decet in omnibus parituri prout statuta dictaverint<sup>3</sup> collegii; inhibentes insuper

vobis, magistro sive custodi et aliis supradictis, ne vos aut vestrum aliquis in preiudicium nostre visitationis huiusmodi interim quicquam attemptetis aut attemptet, faciatis vel faciat aliququaliter attemptari sub pena contemptus de die vero receptionis presentium. Et quid in premissis feceritis nos aut commissarium nostrum huiusmodi dictis die et loco per litteras vestras patentes harum seriei modumque et formam executionis earundem ac citatorum nomina continentes in scedula litteris vestris certificatoriis annexanda vestro sigillo communi sigillatis certificetis.

In cuius rei etc. DAT' etc. primo Maii 1540 et nostre consecrationis anno octavo.

[<sup>1</sup> necessaria in MS.      <sup>2</sup> Properly xiii<sup>o</sup> die.      <sup>3</sup> dictaverit in MS.]

<sup>4</sup> A commission to John Rokebye LL.D., advocate of the court of Canterbury, to visit the college exists in the Bodleian Library, MS. Ch. Lincoln. 1378. It is dated 8 May, 1540]

25[fols 21v.-2]

Licence to William Pegge, of the parish of Berkhamsted (Barkamsted), and Elizabeth Barforde, of the parish of Woodford (Wodford), diocese of Peterborough, to be married in any parish church or chapel within the province by any suitable priest, provided that the banns have first been published three times and that nothing prejudicial be done to Elizabeth's parish church. Lambeth, 24 Sept. 1542.

26

Mandate to M. Nicholas Wutton, D. Cn & C.L., dean, and to the chapter of Christ Church Canterbury. Following the receipt by the archbishop of letters missive, the dean is instructed to assemble all the canons, prebendaries, vicars choral, chaplains and other ministers of the cathedral in the chapter house[and to recite to them the contents of the same. Undated].<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>The contents of the mandate are reconstructed from similar documents. Cf. 11]

27[fol. 22-v.]

[23 Aug. 1543. Mandate to Edmund Bonner, bishop of London, requesting that prayers be said throughout the province for rain to cease]

THOMAS etc. venerabili confratri nostro domino  
Edmundo eadem permissione London' episcopo, vestro ve vicario  
in spiritualibus generali et officiali principali, salutem et  
fraternam in Domino charitatem.

LITTERAS supradioti inviotissimi domini nostri  
Regis nuper recepimus tenorem subsequentem continentes:  
Moast reverend father in God, right trustye and ryght entierly  
beloved, we grete yow well. And for asmuch as there hathe ben  
now a late and still continuith mucche raine and other  
unseasonable wedder wherby is lik to ensue grete hurt and damage  
to the corne and frutes now rype uppon the grownde onles it shall

please God of His infinite goodnes to stretche forth the His  
 holy hande over us; consydering by sundry examples heretofore that  
 God at the contemplation of earnest and devoute prayers oftymes  
 extended His mercy and grace and hath also assuredly promysed  
 that whensoever we call uppon Him for thinges mete for us  
 He will graunte unto us the same, we having the govermente  
 and charge of his people committed unto us have thoght good  
 to cause the same to be exhorted by yow and other the prelates  
 of this our realme with an earnest repentant harte for their  
 iniquities to call unto God for mercie and with devoute and  
 humble prayors and supplicacions every personne, both by  
 him selfe a parte and also by comen prayour, to beseeche Him  
 to send unto us seasonable and temperate wedar to have in thoes  
 fructes and courne on the grownde wiche hetherto He hath caused  
 so plentuously to growe. For the which purpose we requyre you  
 and neverthe lesse commaunde you to send unto all your  
 brotherne the bysshoppes wyth in your province to cause such  
 generall rogacions and processions to be made incontynently  
 within their dioceses as in lyke case heretofore hath been  
 accustomed in this behaulf accordingly.

YEVON under our signet at our maner of the Moore the  
 xx<sup>th</sup> daye of Auguste the xxxv<sup>th</sup> yere of our raine. In  
 capite vero earundem sic scriptum est: By the King. Inscriptio  
 autem hec est: To the moste reverend father in God, our right  
 trustie and right entierly beloved counsailor, the busshopp of  
 Canturbury.

Quibus quidem litteris pro nostro erga sue regie  
 maiestatis excellentiam officio obtemperare(uti par est)



sumnopere cupientes, vestre fraternitati tenore presentium committimus et regie maiestatis vice et nomine (quibus in hac parte fungimur) mandamus QUATENUS attentis premissis sevientis pestis rigore et bellorum tumultibus<sup>1</sup> quibus orbis christianus impresentiarum, ... dolor, undique estuat, omnibus et singulis confratribus nostris coepiscopis nostris et ecclesie nostre Christi Cantuariensis suffraganeis cum ea qua poteritis celeritate accomoda precipiatis ut ipsorum singuli in suis cathedralibus et civitatum ac diocesum suarum parochialibus [fol. 22v.] ecclesiis, exposito publice litterarum regiarum huiusmodi pio<sup>2</sup> et sancto tenore, clericos et laicos infra suas dioceses degentes sedulo et accurate moveant et inducant aut moveri et induci sanctis monitis et salubribus preceptis faciant, atque sic a vobis in civitate et diocese vestra London' fieri volumus, qualibet quarta et sexta feriis publicis supplicationibus et suffragiis Altissimum devote adorent, eorumque precibus (uti fieri assuevit) suam immensam misericordiam implerent<sup>3</sup> quatenus in ira sua, quam nostris malemeritis iuste provocavimus, misericordie sue recordatus, quibus offensus huiusmodi super nos merito immisit afflictiones, propitiatus misericorditer nobis rescipiscentibus submoveat; ab orationibus et suffragiis huiusmodi non cessantes donec aliud a nobis in hac parte habueritis in mandatis.

DAT' in manerio nostro de Croydon xxiii<sup>o</sup> die mensis Augusti anno Domini 1543 et nostre consecrationis anno undecimo.<sup>4</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>tumultibus in MS.      <sup>2</sup>pilo in MS.      <sup>3</sup>implerent in MS.]

<sup>4</sup>Printed, with minor variations, in P.S., Cranmer II, p. 493.]



28

Commission from 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus, ad quem omnis et  
omnimoda iurisdictio spiritualis et ecclesiastica in villa  
Calisie, aliisque locis circumvicinis Morinensis diocesis  
sub obediencia excellentissimi in Christo principis et  
domini domini Henrici[etc.] in terra supremi capitis  
Anglicane ecclesie ubilibet constitutis, mediante auctoritate  
eiusdem domini nostri Regis dinoscitur notorie pertinere'  
 to M. Robert Harvy, LL.B., as commissary of Calais, who is  
 empowered to proceed in all causes arising either ex officio  
 or ad instanciam partium. 'Deputato deputando tibi plenam tenore  
presentium committimus potestatem, teque commissarium nostrum  
primitus ad sancta Dei evangelia per te corporaliter tacta de  
renunciando, refutando et recusando Romano pontifice, eius  
auctoritate et iurisdictione usurpatis iuxta et secundum vim,  
formam et effectum statuti parliamenti regni Anglie in hac  
parte editi et provis<sup>1</sup> rite iuratum ad nostrum beneplacitum  
duntaxat duraturam nominamus[etc.]'. Lambeth, 20 May 1540.<sup>2</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Cf. Stat. Realm. III, pp. 663-6.  
 is blank]

<sup>2</sup>The remainder of fol. 22v.

29[fols 23-4]

[30 Sept. 1541. Commission to M. William Roberts, archdeacon of  
 Merioneth, and to M. Thomas Bulkeleye LL.B. as custodians  
 of the spirituality in the diocese of Bangor sede vacante]

THOMAS permissione divina Cantur' archiepiscopus,  
 totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus, ad quem mediante  
 suprema auctoritate illustrissimi et invictissimi in Christo  
 principis et domini nostri domini Henrici octavi Dei gracia  
 Anglie et Francie Regis, fidei defensoris, Domini Hibernie et  
 in terra supremi capitis Anglicane ecclesie omnis et omnimoda  
 iurisdictionis spiritualis et ecclesiastica que ad episcopum  
 Bangoriensem sede plena pertinuit, ipsa sede iam per translationem  
 venerabilis confratris nostri domini Johannis Byrde dudum<sup>2</sup>  
 episcopi ibidem iam ad novam sedem episcopalem domini Petri  
 civitatis Cestrie nuper suprema et regia auctoritate erectam  
 translata vacante, notorie<sup>3</sup> dinoscitur pertinere, dilectis nobis  
 in Christo filiis Magistris Willimo Robertis archidiacono de<sup>4</sup>  
 Meryoneth et Thome Bulkeleye in legibus baccalario salutem,  
 gratiam et benedictionem.

Cum omnis et omnimoda iurisdictionis<sup>5</sup> spiritualis et  
 ecclesiastica,<sup>6</sup> ad episcopum Bangoriensem, qui pro tempore  
 fuerit nostre Cantuariensis provincie suffraganeus, sede  
 Bangoriensi plena spectans, iam per translationem dicti  
 venerabilis confratris nostri uti premittitur vacante, ipsiusque  
 iurisdictionis exercitium ad nos diote nostre Cantuariensis  
 ecclesie nomine de iure, prerogativa et consuetudine hactenus  
 usitatis et observatis legitimeque prescriptis pacifice et  
 quiete pertinere notorie dinoscantur,<sup>7</sup> nos de fidelitate et  
 circumspectionis vestris in hac parte plurimum confidentes vos  
 coniunctim et divisim vicarios delegatos et commissarios  
 nostros in spiritualibus generales et custodes spiritualitatis  
 civitatis et diocesis Bangoriensium predictarum preficimus,

constituimus et deputamus omnemque et omnimodam iurisdictionem spirituales et ecclesiasticas competentem episcopo Bangoriensi consuetudine vel de iure sede plena ipsiusque iurisdictionis exercitium<sup>8</sup> vobis uti premittitur coniunctim et divisim committimus per presentes.

Ad visitandum igitur ecclesiam cathedralem Bangoriensem predictam in personis, rebus et membris suis, omniaque et singula hospitalia et collegia clericorumque et populum diotarum civitatis et diocesis; necnon ad inquirendum super quorumcumque excessibus, culpis, criminibus et delictis quibuscumque commissis vel committendis diote sedis vacationis durante quorum inquisitio, visitatio, cognitio, correctio et punitio ad forum Ecclesie et nos ratione vacationis diote sedis de iure vel de consuetudine poterunt pertinere, ipsosque et ea ibidem reperta, detecta et iudicata corrigendum et debite puniendum; necnon ad sequestrandum quoscumque fructus et proventus beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum ac alia bona quorumcumque in civitate et diocese predictis, seu alia que casu quocumque a iure, constitutione seu consuetudine premissis fuerint<sup>9</sup> sequestranda ac sequestrationem custodiendum seu faciendum per alios custodiri ac collectores et sequestratores generales et speciales aliosque officarios et ministros in diotis civitate et diocese diota vacatione durante deputandum et ordinandum iuxta et secundum formam in eisdem civitate et diocese hactenus et antiquitus usitatam et observatam; ac etiam ad recipiendum pro nobis et nomine nostro iuramenta collectorum et sequestratorum ac aliorum officiariorum et ministrorum predictorum in hac

parte prestari consueta; ac etiam synodum celebrandum clerumque [fol. 23v.] et populum quatenus ad episcopum Bangoriensem sede plena pertinet convocandum et contumaciter absentes per legitima iuris remedia puniendum; testamentaque quorumcumque in dictis civitate et diocese decedentium et defunctorum quorum insinuatio et approbatio ad episcopum Bangoriensem sede plena debeat pertinere insinuandum et approbandum administrationesque bonorum huiusmodi defunctorum et aliorum quorumcumque etiam ab intestato decedentium executoribus in huiusmodi testamentis nominatis seu aliis personis quibus de iure fuerit faciendum ac vobis visum fuerit expedire in forma iuris committendum, necnon compotum, calculum sive ratiocinium eorum executorum sive administratorum huiusmodi audiendum, discutiendum et eos a compoto sive ratiocinio ulteriori acquietandum et finaliter deliberandum, iurisdictionem<sup>10</sup> quorumcumque inferiorum in dictis civitate et diocese pro tempore vacationis huiusmodi sedis nomine nostro suspendendum, eosque ad hoc si oporteat compescendum, atque omnem et omnimodam iurisdictionem spiritualem et<sup>11</sup> ecclesiasticam ad episcopum Bangoriensem sede plena ad nos ut premittitur ipsa sede iam vacante spectantem<sup>12</sup> exercendum omnesque iurisdictionem et possessionem nostras continuandum et nomine nostro ac ecclesie nostre predictae defendendum; necnon omnes et singulos census cathedralicos seu synodalia et annuales procuraciones etiam crastino animarum debitas et de more eiusdem diocesis episcopo Bangoriensi pro tempore existenti eodem die solvi solitas ac alia emolumenta spiritualia et ecclesiastica ad nos et ecclesiam

nostram Cantuariensem ratione vacationis sedis Bangoriensis  
 predictae qualitercumque spectantia et pertinentia nomine  
 nostro et pro nobis petendum, exigendum et recipiendum<sup>13</sup> atque  
 de receptis litteras solutionum faciendum et litteras  
 acquietanciales liberandum ac usurpata et attempta in contrarium  
 per omnem viam iuris legitimam revocandum et reformandum<sup>14</sup> et  
 contra usurpatores et attemptatores huiusmodi procedendum  
 contradictoresque huiusmodi per quascumque censuras ecclesiasticas  
 rite puniendum et compescendum; adhec omnia alia et singula  
 faciendum, exercendum et expediendum que de iure et consuetudine  
 facienda fuerint in ea parte et que in premissis et circa ea  
 necessaria fuerint seu quomodolibet oportuna vobis et vestrum  
 utrique sive alteri coniunctim et divisim vices nostras  
 committimus cum cuiuslibet cohercionis canonice potestate;  
 assumpto vobis dilecto filio nostro Magistro Anthonio Huse,  
 notario publico, registrario nostro principali seu eius in hac  
 parte deputato in registrarium et scribam nostrum ac registri  
 nostri custodem in ea parte dicta vacatione durante, mandantes  
 vobis quod cessante vacatione huiusmodi et alio episcopo electo  
 et per nos confirmato, consecrato et intronizato de [fol. 24]  
 omni eo quod per vos aut vestrum alterum exercitum, gestum vel  
 expeditum fuerit reddatis certiores per litteras vestras  
 patentes manu autentice conscriptas acta et processus vestros  
 complectentes.

In cuius rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus  
 est appensum. Dat' in manerio nostro de Lambehythe ultimo  
 die mensis Septembris anno Domini 1541 et nostre consecrationis

anno nono.

[<sup>1</sup>Cantir in MS.      <sup>2</sup>Bird was translated to the see of Chester after 4 Aug. 1541; cf. H.B.C., p. 275.      <sup>3</sup>notarie in MS.  
<sup>4</sup>de omitted in MS.      <sup>5</sup>iurisditio in MS.      <sup>6</sup>que added in MS.  
<sup>7</sup>dinoscountur in MS.      <sup>8</sup>exercitum in MS.      <sup>9</sup>fuert in MS.  
<sup>10</sup>iurisdictionem in MS.      <sup>11</sup>et omitted in MS.      <sup>12</sup>spectandam in MS.  
<sup>13</sup>recipiendis in MS.      <sup>14</sup>revocandi et reformandi in MS.]

30[fols 24-5]

Intimation of purgation addressed to all clerics in the diocese of Canterbury, especially to the curate of Preston next Faversham (Preston, Preston iuxta Faversham). In littere requisitorie dated 12 March 1546 at the bishop's palace in Rochester, Henry [Holbeach] 'miseratione divina Roffensis episcopus eadem in regia auctoritate debite fulcitus' gave notice to the archbishop that John Frende, late of Corden in Kent(Kant'), diocese of Canterbury, was recently convicted of felony by the secular courts in Rochester diocese. By force of arms, Frende stole from Thomas Thomas at Preston next Faversham on 30 June, 37 Henry VIII[1545] eighteen ewes, worth £3 and twenty-one rams called 'weders', worth £3. Frende was surrendered to Holbeach, being ordinary, as a convict clerk, whereupon he agreed to undergo purgation. Since the crime was committed outside Rochester diocese, the archbishop is to ensure that in the parish church of Preston next Faversham and other suitable places on Sundays and festivals at mass and at other services, all opposers to Frende's purgation are cited to assemble in

Rochester cathedral before the bishop, his vicar general or special commissary on Wed., 14 April, and that certificates of execution be returned. The archbishop orders that such a proclamation be made[etc.] and that opposers appear in consistory at Rochester[etc.]. Lambeth, 15 March 1546.

31[fol. 25-v.]

Commission at pleasure to M. William Cooke(also Coke). LL.D., as official of the court of Canterbury. He is to rescribe in all suits and appeals, to hear all appeals brought into his audience by the dean of the arches and to do all else necessary, proceeding according to the custom of the court of Canterbury and the laws and statutes of the realm. Lambeth, 28 Feb. 1546.

32[fols 25v.-6]

Commission at pleasure to the same as dean of the arches. Cooke is to visit all churches and chapels, the clergy and people within the deanery and to receive procurations; to proceed in all causes both ex officio and ad instanciam partium; to prove all wills, 'testamentis magnatum et bona spiritualia et temporalia aut debita in diversis diocesis aut iurisdictionibus nostre Cant' provincie dum vixerunt et mortis eorum temporibus habentium exceptis et reservatis', to commit the administration of the goods of those who die intestate to those who may lawfully receive the same; and to do all else necessary. He is



to proceed according to the customs of the deanery and the laws and statutes of the realm. Lambeth, 28 Feb. 1546.

33[fol. 26-v.]

[28 Feb. 1546. Acta at Lambeth in the bestowal upon M. William Cooke, LL.D., layman and married, of the offices of official and dean of the arches, auditor, official principal and commissary of the prerogative following the death of John Cookes]

DIE DOMINICA ultimo Februarii anno 1545 et regni illustrissimi domini nostri Regis Henrici octavi etc. 37 in quadam alta camera infra manerium de Lambeth, reverendissimus dominus Thomas Cramer archiepiscopus Cant' etc., eximio viro Magistro Cooches, presbitero,<sup>1</sup> legum doctore, officiale et decano curie Cant' de archibus, necnon eiusdem reverendissimi audiendorum causarum et negotiorum auditore, commissario generali,<sup>2</sup> cancellario et vicario in spiritualibus generali<sup>2</sup> ac curie prerogative Cant' magistro sive commissario ab humanis exempto, claro viro Magistro Willelmo Coke, laico et coniugato, legum doctore, tunc coram eo presenti, et de renunciando Romano pontifice<sup>3</sup> etc. iuxta statutum Parliamenti regni Anglie anno xxxv<sup>to</sup> eiusdem domini nostri Regis editum<sup>4</sup> ad sancta Dei evangelia iurato, supradicto de archibus, ac<sup>5</sup> audientie et prerogativa officia per eum ad suum beneplacitum exercenda, traditis ei primitus commissionibus suprascriptis et sigillis eisdem officiis respective pertinentiis, contulit atque ipsum Magistrum Willelmum officialem, decanum de archibus,



auditorem, officialem principalem et commissarium<sup>7</sup> prerogative  
sue constituit et iurisdictionem ...<sup>8</sup> iuxta statutum anno  
xxxvii<sup>mo</sup> eiusdem domini nostri Regis pro iurisdictione  
ecclesiastica per laicos exercenda<sup>9</sup> commisit in presentia mei  
Anthonii Huse eius registrarii principalis, Thome Argall  
registrarii prerogative, Henrici Comberforde et Petri Lilley.

[<sup>1</sup>presbiteris in MS.    <sup>2</sup>generale in MS.    <sup>3</sup>pontifici in MS.  
<sup>4</sup>edito in MS.; of. Stat. Realm, III, pp. 955-6.    <sup>5</sup>de in MS.  
<sup>6</sup>traditus in MS.    <sup>7</sup>commissorum in MS.    <sup>8</sup>Properly seriatim?  
<sup>9</sup>exer[fol. 26v.]cenda in MS.; anno xxvii<sup>to</sup> in MS.; of. Stat.  
Realm, III, p. 1009.]

34

[11 Aug. 1545. Mandate to Edmund Bonner, bishop of London,  
enclosing the text of royal letters missive. Suffrages in English  
are to be used every Wednesday and Friday until further notice  
to aid the attempts of the King's forces to achieve victory on  
land and sea]

THOMAS permissione divina etc. venerabili confratri  
nostro domino Edmundo permissione eadem London' episcopo vestrove  
vicario in spiritualibus generali et officiali principali salutem  
et fraternam in Domino charitatem. Litteras missivas  
clarissimorum et prudentissimorum dominorum de privatis conciliis  
sue regie maiestatis manibus subscriptas nobis inscriptas et per  
equos dispositas<sup>1</sup> nuper recepimus tenorem sequentem complectentes:

AFTER OUR ryght hartye commendations to your good

Lordeshype, theis shalbe to sygnyfy unto the same that the  
 Kyng's hyghenes, havynge so provyded for the safty of his  
 grace's realme as the greate<sup>2</sup> mallice of his enemyes shall  
 by grace of God take smale effecte (for the repulsynge of the  
 whiche his hyghenes hathe in a redynes to sett abroad at the  
 furthest on Wedynsdaye nexte suche a puyssaunt navye as  
 hath not ben seene assembled in the remembraunce of man)  
 consyderynge nevertheles that all vyctories and good successes  
 comythe only at the dyrectyon and appoyntement of God, followynge  
 herein the trade of suche a Chrystyan Prynce as he ys, hathe  
 dyvyssed to have processyons throughe out the realme in suche  
 sorte as in lyke caces hathe heretofore laudablye been  
 accustomed; requyrynge your lordeshipe, therefore, to take  
 ordre incontynentlye that from henceforth therowght your  
 province the sayde processyons be kepte contynuallye upon  
 the accustomed dayes and none otherwyse and songe or sayde as  
 the numbere of the quyer shall serve for the same in the  
 Inglyshe tonge, to thentent that there maye be an unyformyte  
 in every place wherby yt maye please God at all tymes to  
 prospere his maiestye in all his affayres and the rather to  
 have regarde at this tyme unto the upryghtnes of his grace's  
 quarrell and to sende his hyghenes vyctoryous successe of the  
 same. And thus we bydde your good lordeshype most hartely  
 well to fare.

From Petworthe the tenth daye of Auguste. Your  
 lordeship's assured lovyng frendes: W. Essex, Stephen  
 Wyntoniensis, Anthonye Browne, William Paget.

Quibus pro nostro officio obtemperare uti decet  
 summo opere cupientes, vestre fraternitati tenore presentium  
 committimus et regie maiestatis vice et nomine, quibus  
 fungimur, mandamus quatenus attentis diligenter litterarum  
 huiusmodi tenore et bellorum tam terrestrium<sup>3</sup> quamque  
 maritimorum tumultibus, quibus hoc incolitum regnum Anglie  
 undique per mare et terram tum in Gallia et Scotia tum in  
 partibus Bolonie assidue infestatur et gravatur, omnibus et  
 singulis[fol. 27] confratribus coepiscopis nostris et ecclesie  
 nostre Christi Cant' suffraganeis, cum ea qua poteritis  
 celeritate accomoda, precipiatis ut ipsorum singuli in  
 suis cathedralibus et civitatum ac diocesum suarum parochialibus  
 ecclesiis, exposito publice litterarum huiusmodi pio et sancto  
 tenore, clericos et<sup>4</sup> laicos infra suas dioceses degentes sedulo  
 et accurate moveant et inducant, aut moveri et induci sanctis  
 monitionibus et salubribus preceptis faciant(atque sic a vobis  
 in civitate et diocese vestra London' fieri volumus), qualibet  
 quarta et sexta feria<sup>5</sup> publicis supplicationibus et suffragiis,  
 dudum in Anglia<sup>6</sup> conceptis et publicatis, concinna modulatione  
 et una voce cunctipotentem Deum Sabaothe, omnis victorie  
 largitorem unicum, sancte et pie non labiis sed corde puro  
 adorent, et presens ac perpetuum ipsius auxilium implorent  
 quatenus eidem domino nostro Regi, exercitibus<sup>7</sup> et classi  
 sue navali(quam non solum ad propulsandos verumetiam ad  
 opprimendos et profligandos hostium suorum sceleratos  
 conatus habet instructissimam) de immensa misericordia et  
 iusticia suis victoriam pariter et triumphum clementer et  
 benigne<sup>8</sup> in tam probato<sup>9</sup> certantibus agone largire et concedere

dignetur, ut devotis hostibus nostris et rebus ex sententia feliciter<sup>10</sup> gestis, illi concordibus animis assidue himnos cantemus triumphales.

Quibus vos tantisper volumus immorari, quoad aliud a nobis inde habueritis in mandatis; vos etiam harum serie<sup>11</sup> in Domino hortamur quod si quid superiori anno in hiis orationibus decantandis et dicendis a vestris gregibus fuerit ostitanter omissum, id nunc resarcire et in melius reformare, habita huius turbulente tempestatis congrua ratione, summo studio, prout fieri confidimus, curetis. Bene valeatis, frater charissime. Ex edibus nostris de Bekysborne nostre Cant' diocesis undecimo Augusti anno Domini 1545 et nostre consecrationis anno 13.<sup>12</sup>

- [<sup>1</sup>dispositos in MS.      <sup>2</sup>Corrected in MS. from grate.  
<sup>3</sup>terrestium in MS.      <sup>4</sup>et omitted in MS.      <sup>5</sup>feriis in MS.  
<sup>6</sup>Anglie in MS.      <sup>7</sup>exercitus in MS.      <sup>8</sup>bennigne in MS.  
<sup>9</sup>probata in MS.      <sup>10</sup>Corrected from feliciter in MS.  
<sup>11</sup>scire in MS.      <sup>12</sup>Printed, with minor variations, in P.S.,  
Cranmer II, pp. 495-6.]

35

[28 Dec. 1544. Mandate to Edmund Bonner, bishop of London, informing him that whereas the King summoned Convocation to assemble in St Paul's cathedral in London on 31 Jan. 1545, he now wishes it to assemble on 16 Oct.]

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus,

totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus venerabili confratri nostro  
 Edmundo eadem permissione London' episcopo salutem et fraternam  
 in Domino charitatem. Breve illustrissimi et invictissimi in  
 Christo principis et domini nostri domini Henrici octavi  
 Dei gracia Anglie, Francie et Hibernie Regis, fidei defensoris  
 et in terra ecclesie Anglicane et Hibernice supreami capitis  
 nuper recepimus in hec verba:

Henricus octavus[etc.] reverendissimo in Christo  
 patri Thome eadem gracia Cant' archiepiscopo totius Anglie  
 primati et metropolitano, salutem. Cum nuper quibusdam arduis  
 et urgentibus negotiis nos, securitatem et defensionem  
 ecclesie Anglicane ac pacem et tranquillitatem, bonum publicum  
 et defensionem regni nostri et subditorum nostrorum eiusdem  
 concernentibus per breve nostrum vobis[fol. 27v.] mandavimus  
 quatenus premissis debite intuitu attentis et ponderatis  
 universos et singulos episcopos vestre provincie ac decanos  
 ecclesiarum cathedralium necnon archidiaconos, capitula et  
 collegia totumque clerum cuiuslibet diocesis eiusdem provincie  
 ad comparandum coram nobis in ecclesia Sancti Pauli London'  
 xxxi<sup>mo</sup> die Januarii proximo futuro more debito convocare  
 faceretis, ad tractandum, consentiendum et concludendum super  
 premissis ac aliis que sibi et clarius exponerentur tunc ibidem  
 ex parte nostra, nos tamen certis urgentibus causis et  
 considerationibus specialiter moventibus de advisamento  
 consilii nostri ipsam convocationem usque ad et in xvi<sup>tu</sup>  
 diem Octobris proximum futurum postposuimus.<sup>1</sup> Episcopos  
 vestre provincie ac decanos ecclesiarum cathedralium necnon  
 archidiaconos, capitula et collegia totumque clerum cuiuslibet

diocesis eiusdem provincie, qui pretextu alterius dicti brevis nostri pro convocatione ... et qui sunt convocandi pretextu eiusdem brevis nostri, ex parte nostra significetis quod ad dictum xxxi<sup>mum</sup> diem Januarii apud Sanctum Paulum predictum non compareant sed quod ad dictum xvi<sup>mum</sup> diem Octobris apud Sanctum Paulum predictum personaliter intersint ad tractandum, consentiendum et concludendum super hiis que clarius sibi exponentur tunc ibidem ex parte nostra. Et hoc sicut nos et statum regni nostri ac honorem et utilitatem ecclesie predictae nullatenus omittatis. Teste meipso apud Westm' xlii<sup>o</sup> die Decembris anno regni nostri tricesimo sexto.

QUOCIRCA fraternitati vestre committimus et mandamus quatenus prioribus nostris litteris non obstantibus, omnibus et singulis dicte ecclesie nostre Cant' suffraganeis ac absentium episcoporum (si qui sint) vicariis in spiritualibus generalibus necnon ecclesiarum cathedralium decanis et singulis eorundem capitulis archidiaconisque et aliis ecclesiarum prelatibus exemptis et non exemptis cleroque cuiuslibet diocesis provincie nostre antedictae, qui pretextu alterius nostri mandati vobis nuper directi<sup>2</sup> ad comparendum coram nobis in ecclesia Sancti Pauli London' ultimo die mensis Januarii proximo futuro, vigore brevis eiusdem domini nostri Regis nuper nobis directi, citati et per vos nominati fuerunt, significetis quod dicto ultimo die mensis Januarii iuxta priorum litterarum nostrarum continentiam non compareant neque eorum aliquis compareat sed auctoritate presentium citetis seu citari faciatis peremptorie eos omnes et singulos quatenus die Veneris

videlicet decimo sexto die mensis Octobris proximo futuro iidem  
 episcopi, vicariique generales, decani, archidiaconi et ceteri  
 ecclesiarum prelati exempti et non exempti personaliter et  
 quodlibet capitulum ecclesiarum cathedralium per unum clerumque  
 cuiuslibet diocesis eiusdem nostre provincie per duos  
 sufficientes procuratores coram nobis aut nostro in hac parte  
 locum tenente aut commissario, si nos tunc impediri contigerit,  
 in ecclesia Sancti Pauli London' dicto<sup>3</sup> decimo sexto die  
 futuro mensis Octobris cum continuatione et prorogatione  
 dierum extunc sequentium et locorum, si et ...<sup>4</sup> expediat,  
 compareant super arduis et urgentibus negotiis securitatem  
 et defensionem ecclesie Anglicane ac pacem, tranquillitatem,  
 bonum publicum et defensionem huius regni concernentibus,  
 ipsisque tunc ibidem serio suo<sup>5</sup> exponendis tractaturi sanaque  
 consilia et auxilia sua super eis impensuri et [fol. 28] hiis  
 que tunc ibidem ex deliberatione communi ad honorem Dei et  
 ecclesie Anglicane commodum in premissis contigerit concorditer  
 ordinari consensum, facturique ulterius et recepturi quod  
 huiusmodi negotium qualitas de se exigit et requirit.

Vos etiam, frater charissime, certiores facimus  
 tenore presentium quatenus non dicto<sup>6</sup> ultimo die Januarii  
 coram nobis aut locum tenente vel commissario comparebitis sed  
 decimo sexto die futuro mensis Octobris fraternitatem vestram  
 coram nobis adesse volumus, super dictis negotiis vobiscum et  
 aliis confratribus nostris uti supra tractaturi; mandantes quatenus  
 presens nostrum mandatum quatenus vestras civitatem et diocesim  
 concernit exequi per omnia faciatis. Vobis preterea iniungimus



et<sup>7</sup> mandamus quod<sup>8</sup> omnibus et singulis venerabilibus fratribus nostris, coepiscopis vestris, vel vicariis huiusmodi iniungatis seu iniungi faciatis quod singuli eorum singulatim de facto suo, quatenus pertinet ad eosdem, nos seu locum tenentem nostrum vel commissarios nostros dicto decimo sexto die Octobris loco capitulari prefato per litteras suas patentes citatorum<sup>9</sup> nomina et cognomina continentes distincte certificent et aperte; vosque pari forma nos vel commissarios nostros, quatenus ad vos attinet, eisdem die et loco modo solito debite certificetis per litteras vestras patentes hunc tenorem habentes sigillo vestro sigillatas.

Dat' in manerio nostro de Lambhithe xxvij<sup>vo</sup> die mensis Decembris anno Domini 1544 et nostre consecrationis anno xij<sup>o</sup>.

[<sup>1</sup>postposuimus omitted in MS.    <sup>2</sup>dilecti in MS.    <sup>3</sup>dito in MS.  
<sup>4</sup>quantus in MS.; properly quatenus?    <sup>5</sup>suis in MS.    <sup>6</sup>dito in MS.  
<sup>7</sup>et omitted in MS.    <sup>8</sup>que in MS.    <sup>9</sup>ootatorum in MS.]

36[fol. 28-v.]

Royal writ to the archbishop proroguing convocation, on the advice of the council, from St Paul's cathedral on 16 Oct. to Eton college on 24 Nov. The writ is to be transmitted to the clergy of the province[itemized as in the royal writ in 35 omitting the stipulations concerning proctors]. Westminster, 22 Sept., 37 Henry VIII[1545].



37[fols 28v.-9]

Commission at pleasure from King Edward VI to the archbishop of Canterbury for the exercise of his jurisdiction within the diocese and province of Canterbury, in which the preamble emphasises that the jurisdiction of all magistrates, both ecclesiastical and secular, emanates from the crown and from the King as supreme head. Such jurisdiction has been exercised precariously, and the King wishes men to recognize that it is granted by the crown alone. In response to the archbishop's requests, the King licences him to ordain men from the diocese of Canterbury who are found to be suitable in learning and morals. He may admit, institute, invest or deprive those presented to benefices within the diocese, if they are suitable, and collate men to benefices in his own gift. He is to prove the wills of those who have goods in several dioceses or jurisdictions, and to administer the goods of all those who die intestate, according to the custom of the prerogative court of Canterbury, and to prove wills and administer goods within his diocese. He may judge all causes which come before him falling 'ad forum ecclesiasticum...citra legum nostrarum et statutorum regni nostri offensionem'; he may also appoint deputies. A general clause empowers him to do all else necessary 'preter et ultra ea que tibi ex sacris litteris divinitus commissa esse dinoscuntur'. Any previous inhibition of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is to be of no effect. The King enjoins the archbishop to perform his office according to the norms of Holy Scripture and to ensure that he admit no-one to holy orders or to have cure of souls unless their character, learning and other qualifications are exemplary, for the

corruption of all virtue, especially within the Christian religion, stems from wicked pastors. If faithful shepherds are appointed, the King does not doubt but that the true religion of Christ will be restored and an improvement in men's lives and manners ensue. Sealed with the seal ad causas ecclesiasticas.  
7 Feb., 1547(1 Edw. VI).<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Printed in Wilkins, op. cit., IV, pp. 2-3]

38[fol. 29-v.]

[11 Sept. 1539. Commission to M. John Incent, LL.D., as keeper of the spirituality in the diocese of London sede vacante]

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus,  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus ad infra scripta per  
illustrissimum in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum  
Henricum octavum Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Regem, fidei  
defensorem, Dominum Hibernie et in terra supremum caput  
Anglicane ecclesie sufficienter auctorizatus dilecto nobis  
in Christo Magistro Johanni Incent, legum doctori,<sup>1</sup> canonico  
maiori ecclesie cathedralis Sancti Pauli London', SALUTEM,  
graciam et benedictionem.

QUIA sede episcopali per mortem naturalem bone  
memorie domini Johannis nuper London' episcopi<sup>2</sup> iam vacante,  
decanus et capitulum ipsius ecclesie cathedralis te et Johannem  
Reston<sup>3</sup> ac Willilum Grene,<sup>4</sup> sacre theologie professores, dicte  
ecclesie cathedralis etiam canonicos maiores, nobis per suas

litteras patentes nominaverunt humiliter supplicantes quatenus unum ex eisdem nominatis, quem duxerimus<sup>5</sup> eligendum seu acceptandum, officialem nostrum London' ad exercendum omnimodam iurisdictionem episcopalem in dictis civitate et diocese ipsius ecclesie vacatione durante iuxta formam compositionis<sup>6</sup> inter pie recordationis dominum Bonifacium, quondam Cant' archiepiscopum predecessorem nostrum, ex parte una ac decanum et capitulum [fol. 29v.] diote ecclesie cathedralis ex parte altera dudum facte, perficere et constituere dignaremur, NOS, tue circumspectionis industria confidentes, tuam personam inter alias personas nobis huiusmodi officialitatis ad officium ut premittitur nominatas<sup>7</sup> elegimus in hac parte teque officialem nostrum London' ad exercendum omnimodam et plenarie iurisdictionem episcopalem in civitate et diocese supradictis ipsius ecclesie vacatione durante iuxta formam compositionis predictae preficimus et constituimus per presentes. Tibi firmiter iniungendo mandamus quatenus officium huiusmodi iuxta iuramentum tuum corporale secundum formam compositionis antedictae in ea parte prestandum prudenter et diligenter exerceas ac nobis seu nostro in hac parte deputato de omnibus et singulis obventionibus, proventibus et emolumentis quibuscumque ratione iurisdictionis<sup>8</sup> seu officii huiusmodi provenientius nobis et ecclesie nostre Christi Cantur' de iure et consuetudine iuxta formam diote compositionis debite et fideliter respondeas, CETERAQUE omnia et singula facias que tenor et effectus diote compositionis de te exigunt et requirunt; ad que faciendum etiam et exercendum tibi committimus vices nostras cum cuiuslibet censure ecclesiastice potestate.

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus

est appensum. DAT' in manerio nostro de Forde undecimo die mensis  
Septembris anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo nono  
et nostre consecrationis anno septimo.

[<sup>1</sup>Incent was prebendary of Weldland in St Paul's cathedral, cf.  
J.M. Horn, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, 12 vols  
(London, 1962-7), V, p. 68. <sup>2</sup>John Stokesley died on  
8 Sept. Cf. ibid., p. 4. <sup>3</sup>John Royston was prebendary,  
of Pancratius. Cf. ibid., p. 55. <sup>4</sup>Greene was prebendary  
of Holbourn. Cf. ibid., p. 41. <sup>5</sup>dixerimus in MS.  
<sup>6</sup>For the text of the composition, cf. Churchill, op. cit.,  
II, pp. 47-54. <sup>7</sup>nominatis in MS. <sup>8</sup>iurisdictionibus in MS.]

39[fols 29v.-31]

General notification of the definitive sentence concerning the  
award of a pension from the fruits of the vicarage of Preston  
next Faversham(Preston) in the name of 'THOMAS permissione  
divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus  
auctoritate illustrissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri  
domini Henrici octavi Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Regis, fidei  
defensoris, Domini Hibernie ac in terris supremi ecclesie  
Anglicane sub Christo capitis<sup>1</sup> sufficioenter et legitime deputatus'.

M. John Cockes LL.D. auditor of causes, official principal,  
vicar general and chancellor sat judicially to award the  
pension following the resignation of Richard Robertes clk and  
the archbishop's collation of Richard Manpas clk to the vicarage.<sup>2</sup>  
M. William Saye(also Say), notary public, appeared for Robertes and

est appensum. DAT' in manerio nostro de Forde undecimo die mensis  
Septembris anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo nono  
et nostre consecrationis anno septimo.

[<sup>1</sup>Incent was prebendary of Weldland in St Paul's cathedral, of.  
J.M. Horn, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, 12 vols  
(London, 1962-7), V, p. 68. <sup>2</sup>John Stokesley died on  
8 Sept. Cf. ibid., p. 4. <sup>3</sup>John Royston was prebendary,  
of Pancratius. Cf. ibid., p. 55. <sup>4</sup>Greene was prebendary  
of Holbourn. Cf. ibid., p. 41. <sup>5</sup>dixerimus in MS.  
<sup>6</sup>For the text of the composition, of. Churchill, op. cit..  
II, pp. 47-54. <sup>7</sup>nominatis in MS. <sup>8</sup>iurisdictionibus in MS.]

39[fols 29v.-31]

General notification of the definitive sentence concerning the  
award of a pension from the fruits of the vicarage of Preston  
next Faversham(Preston) in the name of 'THOMAS permissione  
divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus  
auctoritate illustrissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri  
domini Henrici octavi Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Regis, fidei  
defensoris, Domini Hibernie ac in terris supremi ecclesie  
Anglicane sub Christo capitis<sup>1</sup> sufficienter et legitime deputatus'.

M. John Cookes LL.D. auditor of causes, official principal,  
vicar general and chancellor sat judicially to award the  
pension following the resignation of Richard Robertes clk and  
the archbishop's collation of Richard Manpas clk to the vicarage.<sup>2</sup>  
M. William Saye(also Say), notary public, appeared for Robertes and

Manpas appeared in person. Cockes decreed that the resignation of Robertes was lawful and that the vicarage could support a pension. He therefore assigned a pension of £4 per annum to be paid by Manpas and his successors to Robertes in two equal portions. The site of payment is to be the nave of the conventual church of St Augustine beyond the walls of Canterbury. The dates of payment are to be the nativity of St John Baptist [24 June] and the nativity of our Lord [25 Dec.]. The first payment is to be made at the nativity of St John Baptist, 1536. Should any future incumbent refuse to swear to pay the pension, his institution is to be invalid. Should Manpas or his successors be negligent in payment, Robertes is empowered to require them to comply. Should they still refuse after thirty days, they are to incur the penalty of greater excommunication until they undergo purgation. The archbishop, his successors or the keeper of the spirituality sede vacante are to sequester the fruits of the vicarage until the pension is paid with expenses. Lambeth, 18 Dec. 1535.

[<sup>1</sup>Although the King is addressed as supreme head of the English church sub Christo, the act of supremacy contained no such qualification. Cf. Stat. Realm, III, p. 492. <sup>2</sup>Cf. C.R., fol. 357]

40[fol. 31-v.]

Mandate to Edmund [Bonner], bishop of London, reciting an inhibition from the crown, sealed with the seal ad causas

ecclesiasticas and dated 4 May 1547(1 Edw. VI). Since the King intends very soon to visit all churches, clergy and people within the realm, the archbishop is inhibited under pain of contempt from exercising powers of visitation and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, lest he attempt anything to prejudice the King's visitation, until he is licensed by the crown. He is to communicate the inhibition to the bishops of the province of Canterbury, who in turn are to direct it to all archdeacons and those who exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in places both exempt and non-exempt. Since not only the souls of the King's subjects, but also their security have been gravely harmed by the contending opinions of preachers, the King has decided that in order to put an end to diversity of opinion, the archbishop is to inhibit, under pain of contempt, all bishops from preaching outside their cathedrals and all other ecclesiastics from preaching outside the collegiate or parish churches in which they hold their title until they receive a royal licence. The archbishop orders the bishop of London to communicate the contents of the inhibition to the bishops of the province, or vicars general in their absence. Lambeth, 15 May 1547.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Printed in Wilkins, Concilia, IV, p. 14]

41[fols 31v.-2]

Mandate to the same, reciting a relaxation from the King, sealed [eto.; of. 40] and dated 16 May 1547(1 Edw. VI)[recital of the



terms of the royal inhibition in 40, omitting the stipulations concerning preachers]. Lest the King's subjects suffer injury or incur expense through the suspension of ecclesiastical administration, the crown licences the archbishop, bishops, archdeacons, commissaries and all who possess ecclesiastical jurisdiction to resume their administration. They are to act according to their prerogatives and the King's commission until they receive a monition for the visitation from the King's commissaries. They may proceed in all causes in ecclesiastical courts, prove wills and administer goods within their diocese and jurisdiction and collate, admit and institute those presented to benefices. The archbishop orders the bishop of London [etc.; cf. 40]. Lambeth, 3 June 1547.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Printed in Wilkins, op. cit., IV, pp. 14-15.]

42[fol. 32-v.]

[24 Feb., 1548. Mandate to the bishop of London, enclosing letters missive from the council dated 21 Feb., ordering the complete removal of all images within the province]

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus,  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus per illustrissimum  
in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum Edouardum  
sextum Dei gracia Anglie, Francie et Hibernie Regem, fidei  
defensorem et in terra ecclesie Anglicane et Hibernice supremum  
caput sufficienter et legitime auctorizatus VENERABILI confratri



nostro domino Edmundo eadem permissione London' episcopo  
vestrove vicario in spiritualibus generali et officiali  
prinoipali, salutem et fraternam in Domino charitatem.  
Litteras missivas clarissimorum et prudentissimorum dominorum  
de privato consilio sue regie maiestatis manibus subscriptas  
nobisque inscriptas et directas nuper recepimus tenorem  
subsequentem complectentes:

AFTER our right hartye commendatyons to your good  
lordeship, where nowe of late in the Kinge's maieste's  
visitatyon, amonge other godlye iniunctyons commaunded to be  
generallye observed throughe all partes of this his highenes'  
realme, one was sett forthe for the takynge downe of all suche  
images as had at any tyme ben abused with pilgrymages,  
offerynges or sensynges; albeyt that this saide iniunctyon  
hathe in many partes of the realme ben well and quyetye  
obeyed and executed, yet in many other places muche stryfe and  
contentyon hathe rysen, and daylye rysethe, and more and more  
enoreaseth about the executyon of the same, some men beyng so  
superstycious or rather wyllfull as theye wolde by there  
good willes reteyne all suche images styll, allthoughe they  
have ben moste manyfestly abused; and in some places allso  
the images, whiche by the sayde iniunctyons were taken downe,  
be nowe restored and set up agayne; and allmoste in every  
place ys contentyon for images, whether they have ben abused  
or not; and whiles thes men goe aboute on bothe sydes  
contentiouslye tobtayne theyre myndes, contendynge whether  
this or that image hathe ben offred unto, kyssed, senced or

otherwyse abused, partyes have in some places ben taken in  
 suche sorte as further inconvenience ys very like to ensue  
 yf remedye be not provided in tyme; considering therfore  
 that allmooste in no places of the realme is any sure quyetnes  
 but where all images be hooly taken awaye and pulled downe  
 allredye; to thintent thall<sup>1</sup> contentyon in everye parte  
 of the realme for this matter may be clerely taken awaye,  
 and that the lyvely images[fol. 32v.] of Chryste shulde  
 not contende for the deade images, which be thinges not  
 necessarye and without which the churches of Chryste contynued  
 mooste godlye many yeres, we have thought good to sygnifye  
 unto you that his highenes' pleasure withadvyse and consent  
 of us the lorde protector and the reste of the counsell ys  
 that immediatlye upon the sight herof, with as convenient  
 dilygence as you maye, you shall not only gyve order that  
 all the images remayninge in any church or chapell within  
 your diocese be removed and taken awaye, but also by your  
 letters signyfy unto the reste of the busshopes within  
 your provynce his<sup>2</sup> highenes' pleasure for the lyke order to  
 be gyven by them and every of them within their severall  
 dioceses. And in therecutyon hereof we requyre bothe you and  
 the rest of the sayde byssshopes to use suche foresyghte as  
 the same maye be quyetly donne with as good satysfacyon of  
 the people as maye be. Thus fare your good lordeshipe well.  
 From Somersett Place the xxi<sup>st</sup> of Februaarye 1547.<sup>3</sup> Your  
 lordship's assured frendes: E. Somerset, John Russell, Henricus  
 Arundell, T. Seymour, Anthony Wyngefelde, William Pagett.

QUIBUS quidem litteris pro nostro erga suam regiam

maiestatem officio uti decet obtemperare summopere cupientes,  
 vestre fraternitati tenore presentium committimus et regie  
 maiestatis vice et nomine (quibus in hac parte fungimur)  
 mandamus quatenus attento diligenter litterarum huiusmodi  
 tenore omnibus et singulis confratribus oepiscopis nostris  
 et ecclesie nostre Christi Cant' suffraganeis, cum ea qua  
 poteritis celeritate accomoda, precipiatis ut ipsorum singuli  
 in suis cathedralibus necnon civitatum et diocesum suarum  
 parochialibus ecclesiis, exposito publice litterarum huiusmodi  
 tenore, omnia et singula in litteris preinsertis comprehensa,  
 deducta et descripta, quatenus eos concernunt, in omnibus et  
 per omnia exequi et perimpleri sedulo et accurate curent et  
 fieri non postponant; sicque a vobis, frater charissime, in  
 civitate et diocese vestris Londoniensibus per omnia et  
 perimpleri volumus et mandamus.

DAT' in manerio nostro de Lambeth the vicesimo quarto  
 die mensis Februarii anno Domini iuxta computationem ecclesie  
 Anglicane millesimo quingentesimo quadragésimo septimo et  
 nostre consecrationis anno decimo quinto.<sup>4</sup>

[<sup>1</sup> thall all in MS.      <sup>2</sup> this in MS.      <sup>3</sup> red <sup>th</sup> in MS.]

<sup>4</sup> On 6 February 1548, a royal proclamation had been issued which  
 attempted to forbid private innovations in ecclesiastical  
 ceremonies. Cf. Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations, I, pp. 416-17.  
 The archbishop's mandate is printed, with minor variations, in  
 P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 509-11.]

43[fols 32v.-3]

The like to the archdeacon of Canterbury, with 'the lyvelye ymages shulde not contende' for 'the lyvely images of Chryste shulde not contende' and the names of the privy councillors given in the order 'E. Somersett, T. Cantuariensis, J. Russell, Henricus Arundell, T. Seymour, William Pagett, Anthonye Wingefelde'. The archbishop instructs the archdeacon to assemble before him the masters of all collegiate churches, the rectors and vicars of all parish churches and all priests within the diocese of Canterbury as quickly as possible and to publish the contents of the letters missive and the royal injunctions, enjoining obedience to them. 24 Feb., 1548.

44

General notification that Thomas Atkinson, clk, citizen of London, is a notary public by royal authority of proven worth within the city of London[Undated]

45[fol. 33v.-4]

Commission to M. Ellis Price, LL.D., as vicar delegate, commissary general and keeper of the spirituality of the see of St David's sede vacante following the King's translation of William Barlowe to the see of Bath and Wells. He is empowered to visit the cathedral, clergy and people in personis, rebus et membris; to investigate their observance of the royal injunctions and to punish offenders; to sequester the fruits of benefices, to appoint collectors and to receive their oaths;

to celebrate synods; to prove wills and to commit the administration of the goods of those who die intestate to those who may lawfully receive it; to receive cathedral taxes or synodals and annual procurations and other spiritual emoluments; to admit, institute and induct men into benefices; and to do all else necessary. He is to govern according to statutes, canon law and custom. He is first to renounce papal jurisdiction. Anthony Huse, notary public and the archbishop's principal registrar, or his deputy is to be scribe of the acts and keeper of the register. Following the consecration and enthronement of a new bishop, Price is to send a copy of the acts to the archbishop. Lambeth, 6 April 1548.

46[fols 34-v.]

Commission to M. William Cooke, LL.D., official of the court of Canterbury and dean of the arches, to admit John Lewys(also Lewes), notary public, as a proctor in the court of Canterbury. Lambeth, 24 Feb. 1548.

47[fols 34v.-6v.]

General notification of the award of a pension from the parish church of Crayford(Eard or Earde alias Crayforde), deanery of Shoreham, in the name of 'THOMAS permissione divina ecclesie Christi Cant' prior et eiusdem loci capitulum ad quos omnis et omnimoda iurisdicatio spiritualis et ecclesiastica

que ad archiepiscopum Cant' pertinuit sede plena. ipsa sede  
iam per obitum recolende memorie domini Willelmi Warham nuper  
dicte sedis archiepiscopi vacante notorie dinoscitur pertinere'.

M. Richard Parkehurst MA has resigned the parish church of Crayford, which is in the patronage of Thomas Nevill, Kt, by a grant hac vice from Thomas Lyslie alias Thomas Lyle (also Lysle) Kt. M. Roger Harman MA has been instituted as rector.<sup>1</sup> M. John Cookes (also Cookis) LL.D., vicar general, sat judicially before Parkehurst and Harman, who both appeared in person. Cookes decreed that Parkehurst's resignation was lawful, that he had obtained a licence to communicate for a pension and that the parish church could bear such a charge. Cookes instituted Harman as rector and assigned a pension of £10 per annum to be paid by the latter and his successors in two equal portions at the feast of the annunciation of the B.V.M. [25 March] and the feast of St Michael the Archangel [29 Sept.]. The site of payment is to be at the font in St Paul's cathedral, London, between 9 am and 11 am. Lyslie submitted a written instrument recording his assent. The first payment is to take place at the feast of the annunciation of the B.V.M. next [1533]. Should any future rector be instituted without swearing to pay the pension, his appointment is to be invalid. Should Harman or his successors violate the decree, Parkehurst is to require them to comply. Should they refuse to pay the pension after fifteen days, they are to incur the penalty of greater excommunication until they undergo purgation. If the pension is still in arrears after twenty days, the rector is to be deprived. The

fruits are to be sequestered and given to Parkehurst, who may enjoy them until he has received his dues with interest. Should anyone else attempt to enjoy the sequestered fruits, he is to incur a sentence of greater excommunication. Every future rector at his admission is to renounce before the prior and chapter sede vacante or the archbishop sede plena all rights to overturn the decree. London; sealed with the common seal, 9 Dec. 1532.

[<sup>1</sup>The institution of Harman is not recorded in Calendar of Institutions by the Chapter of Canterbury Sede Vacante, edited for The Records Branch, Kent Archaeological Society by C.E. Woodruff and I.J. Churchill (Canterbury, 1924); cf. ibid., p. 41]

48[fols 36v.-7]

[24 June, 1278. Composition between the prior and chapter of Christ Church Canterbury and the bishops suffragan of the province concerning ecclesiastical administration during a vacancy in the see of Canterbury]

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. Cum inter venerabilem dominum Johannem Dei gracia Londoniensem episcopum et quosdam alios suffraganeos ecclesie Christi Cantuariensis ex parte una et venerabiles viros dominos priorem et capitulum ecclesie Christi Cantuariensis ex altera super usu et exercitio iurisdictionis metropolitice sedis Cantuariensis vacantis per translationem domini Roberti Dei gracia nuper Cantuariensis archiepiscopi in Portuensem episcopum cardinalem assumpti<sup>1</sup>



dicta sede vacante esset materia discordie seu contentionis exorta, tandem prefati episcopi, prior et capitulum, considerantes ex huiusmodi contentione et discordia iam gravia imminere dispendia et imposterum inde maiora posse<sup>2</sup> pericula seu scandala provenire, post varios tractatus super pacis reformatione inter eos habitos in quandam formam pacis seu compositionis expresse consenserunt, que talis est: videlicet quod semper vacante sede Cant' liceat et liberum sit sine contradictione et obstaculo cuiusquam priori seu presidenti ibidem et capitulo nominare duos viros idoneos, iurisperitos, discretos seu causarum experienciam habentes et indigenos<sup>3</sup> et nominationem huiusmodi [fol. 37] significant literatorie London' episcopo qui pro tempore fuerit, si idem episcopus superstes et in Cantuariensi provincia extiterit, infra mensem a tempore noticia vacationis diote sedis, exercitio iurisdictionis medio tempore penes prefatos priorem et capitulum residente; quod si infra mensem non nominaverint et significaverint extunc donec nominaverint et significaverint in forma predicta eisdem impune non pareatur. Qui episcopus unum de predictis viris nominatis acceptare, gratificare sive approbare infra duos dies a die nominationis sibi insinuate teneatur. Qui sic approbatus, gratificatus seu acceptatus per eosdem priorem vel ibidem presidentem et capitulum officialis<sup>4</sup> Cant' constituetur sive creabitur et extunc nomine, vice et auctoritate eorundem prioris et capituli in tota Cantuariensi provincia iurisdictionem huiusmodi libere exercebit sicut officialis domini archiepiscopi sede plena facere



consuevit et consistorium suum tenebit ubi sibi videbitur expedire. PROVISIO tamen quod in suffraganeos episcopos dicte sedis vel eorum aliquem non<sup>5</sup> proferat sententias interdicti, suspensionis vel excommunicationis nisi ex probabili et rationabili causa iuris necessitas id exposcat, et tunc cum moderamine et reverencia qua decet. Idem vero prior vel ibidem presidens cum officiale memorato et aliquibus de senioribus et<sup>6</sup> discretioribus ipsius capituli in confirmationibus electorum in episcopos procedent prout secundum Deum et iusticiam eis videbitur expedire. Qui si voluerint aliquem de suffraganeis episcopis ad hoc sibi associare poterunt, nulla tamen necessitate sibi<sup>7</sup> incumbente. In consecrationibus vero suffraganei episcopi secundum canonicas sanctiones et prout moris est auctoritate predictorum prioris vel ibidem presidentis et capituli convocentur. Si vero dictus London' episcopus superstes non fuerit aut in provincia predicta non extiterit, dicte nominationis insinuatio fiat Winton' episcopo si superstes fuerit et in Cant' provincia extiterit. Qui infra duos dies a die nominationis sibi insinuate huiusmodi nominationem acceptare, gratificare sive approbare teneatur. Quod si Winton' superstes non fuerit sive in provincia non extiterit fiat hoc ut supra Wigorniensis episcopo, qui eodem modo procedere teneatur. Quod si idem Wigorn' episcopus superstes non fuerit vel in provincia non extiterit, fiat hoc ut supra viciniore episcopo suffraganeo; hoc adhibito moderamine quod si aliquis de supradictis episcopis infra tempus superius expressum non gratificaverit, acceptaverit seu approbaverit ut

superius continetur, extunc liceat priori vel ibidem presidenti et capitulo memorato unum de supradictis duobus nominatis quem voluerint libere constituere seu creare officialem. Qui sic libere iurisdictionem exerceat ac si esset acceptatus sive approbatus prout superius annotatur.

Actum est<sup>8</sup> etiam, si officialis sic creatus in suo officio indiscrete aut perperam se gerat, quod liceat dictis priori vel ibidem presidenti et capitulo ipsum officialem ab officio amovere et ad creationem alterius procedere secundum formam superius annotatam. Idem et fiet si officialem huiusmodi cedere vel decedere contingat. ET est sciendum quod partes supradicte expresse renunciant omnibus appellationibus et provocationibus interpositis hinc et inde pretextu vel occasione discordie supradicte nequaquam querelis et actionibus, que<sup>9</sup> ipsis competere poterant, quocumque iure vel facto pretextu premissorum et expensas hinc inde factas occasione predicta sibi invicem remiserunt. Sentencie vero interdicti, suspensionis et excommunicationis a quibuscumque et contra quoscumque prolata pretextu seu occasione discordie supradicte nullum robur obtineant vel vigorem. Ad perpetuam vero memoriam premissorum super compositione seu pacis reformatione predictis duo eiusdem tenoris confecta sunt instrumenta preterquam in data diei et loci propter partium absenciam et locorum distanciam. Quorum unum sigillo predictorum prioris et capituli sigillatum penes dictum dominum episcopum, aliud vero sigillis<sup>10</sup> predicti domini London' episcopi et suffraganeorum suorum huic ordinationi seu compositioni

assensum prebentium sigillatum penes prefatos priorem et  
capitulum remanebit. Dat' Londoni viii kal' Julii anno  
Domini millesimo ducentesimo septuagesimo octavo.<sup>11</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Robert Kilwardby was translated to the see of Porto on 12 March, 1278; cf. H.B.C., p. 211. <sup>2</sup>post se in MS. <sup>3</sup>indigenas in MS. <sup>4</sup>officialem in MS. <sup>5</sup>non interlined as a correction. <sup>6</sup>ex in MS. <sup>7</sup>sibi interlined as a correction. <sup>8</sup>et in MS. <sup>9</sup>que omitted in MS. <sup>10</sup>sigill in MS. <sup>11</sup>Printed in Calendar of Institutions by the Chapter of Canterbury sede vacante, edited for the Kent Archaeological Society, Records Branch, vol. VIII(Canterbury, 1924), pp. 144-6; with this important variant: eisdem inpune pareatur for eisdem inpune non pareatur.]

[fols 37v.-8v. blank]

42[fol. 39]

Licence to Thomas Audley(Audeley), Kt of the Garter, Baron Audley of Walden, chancellor of England, and Elizabeth his wife, their sons and household to enjoy the sacraments of Eucharist, penance and infant baptism in any chapel, provided that it be decent, from a chaplain or chaplains, provided that nothing prejudicial be done to the local parish church.  
Lambeth, 23 April 1540.

[of. 53]

50

Commission to M. Richard Gwent, archdeacon of London, dean of

the arches and official of the court of Canterbury, to admit  
M. Christopher Nevinson(Nevenson) LL.D., as an advocate of  
the court even if the number of advocates is complete.

[Undated; temp. Henry VIII]

51[fol. 39v.]

Letters testimonial certifying that Patrick Frebarn, a Scot  
(Sootie) and monk from Paisley abbey(Pasletum), diocese of  
Glasgow(Glasgou'), has been and is a duly ordained priest.  
Lambeth, 30 Jan. 1540.

52[fols 39v.-40]

Commission at pleasure to M. Robert Harvy, LL.B., as commissary  
within the town and marches of Calais, diocese of Théroutanne.  
He is empowered to proceed in all causes, both ex officio  
and ad instanciam partium, and to punish all crimes belonging  
ad forum ecclesiasticum. He may prove the wills of all those  
who die not having bona et credita notabilia in the province of  
Canterbury and commit the administration of the goods of  
those who die intestate to executors; sequester the fruits of  
parish churches and of the laity; and visit all churches and  
chapels, clergy and people and punish all crimes. He may  
grant a licence to a bishop 'infra regnum dicti illustrissimi  
domini Regis regenti ac titulum sedis sue episcopalis ab eodem  
domino nostro Rege et non alio obtinenti', who may confirm  
children, consecrate and reconcile churches and cemeteries and

dispense with parties wishing to marry so that the banns may be published twice or once. The commissary is to admit, institute and induct all clergy to benefices and a general clause empowers him to do all else necessary. He is to act according to statute, canon law and custom and to take Anthony Huse, the archbishop's principal registrar, or a deputy, as scribe of the acts and keeper of the archbishop's register. Lambeth, 20 May 1540.

[Cf. 28]

53

Licence to Thomas Audley(also Audeley), Kt, Baron Audley of Walden, chancellor of England, and to Elizabeth his wife to have their children baptized in any baptistery, provided that it be decent. Lambeth, 3 April 1540.

[Cf. 49]

54A[fol. 40-v.]

Commission for the visitation of All Souls College, Oxford, from the archbishop 'auotoritate illustrissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri domini Henrici octavi Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Regis etc. sufficienter et legitime suffultus' to M. John Cockes LL.D., vicar general in spirituals and official of the court of Canterbury, and M. John Rokesby LL.D., dean of

the arches, 'quos sic per<sup>1</sup> presentes nominamus' which stresses that pastoral care demands that the archbishop superintend the lives of those committed to his cure and that the goods bestowed by the faithful be used aright. The archbishop ordered that the college should be visited on 12 May 1541; due to pressure of business from the King, however, the archbishop commissioned M. Walter Wryght LL.D. also dean of the arches to visit the college on that day and to prorogue the visitation until Tuesday, 31 May. Since the archbishop is still detained by public business, Cookes and Rokesby are empowered to visit the college on 31 May. They are to minister articles to the members, who are to testify on oath to the truth concerning abuses. They are also to punish crimes, to expel the warden, deputy warden, any fellow, scholar or servant should the need arise, to deliver injunctions and to do all else necessary. Lambeth, 16 May 1541.

[<sup>1</sup> per omitted in MS.]

54B[fol. 41]

Commission to M. Walter Wryght LL.D., dean of the arches, 'quem sic per presentes nominamus'. The archbishop previously issued a citation in which he ordered that the college of All Souls was to be visited on 12 May. Due to pressure of business, the archbishop is unable to perform the visitation in person. On the day of visitation, Wryght is to enter the chapel and in the presence of the warden and fellows prorogue the

visitation until the Tuesday following the feast of the Ascension, 31 May, between 7 am and 9 am. He is also to take a notary public as scribe. Lambeth, 7 May 1541.

54C[fol. 41-v.]

Citation addressed to the master or warden and the fellows of All Souls College, Oxford. The archbishop stresses that he wishes to root out vices and to return the college to a pristine state. All members of the college are to assemble in the chapel on Thurs., 12 May. They are inhibited from exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction from the time of receipt. The warden is to certify to his execution of the citation in letters patent on the day of the visitation containing a schedule of the names of those cited and sealed with the common seal. Lambeth, 22 April 1541.

54D

Certificate of execution from John Warner MD, warden, who received the archbishop's citation on 29 April and read it to the fellows and servants of the college in the college chapel. The citation was also nailed to the doors of the chapel.<sup>1</sup> Sealed with 'sigillum officii mei predicti quod penes me remanet et quo in hac parte utor'. 10 May, 1541.

[<sup>1</sup> viginti quatuor vestrarum spacio in MS; meaning unclear.]



54E[fols 41v.-2]

Schedule of the names of those cited; John Warner M.D., warden;  
 Thomas Daye, LL.B., deputy warden; William Hyll LL.B.; John  
 Pryce LL.B.; Thomas Kaye M.A., bursar; Edmund Schether M.A.,  
rector theologie; John Howell M.A.; William Walker(Walbere) M.A.;  
 John James M.A.; John Asthewell LL.B.; William Turnebull LL.B.;  
 Nicholas Alambygg M.A., dean of the arts; Richard Ryve, M.A.;  
 Arthur Pyttes LL.B.; Robert Frauncis B.A.; George Grysolde M.A.;  
 John Roo M.A.; John Fullar LL.B., bursar; Roger Wigmore LL.B.;  
 William Dalbye LL.B.; Robert Westone LL.B.; James Schalcrosse,  
 jurist, non-graduate; [fol. 42] Nicholas Bullyngham, jurist,  
 non-graduate and keeper of the keys; John Heryng B.A.; John  
 Lewys M.A.; John Awsten B.A.; John Herne B.A.; John Dune B.A.,  
 keeper of the keys; Christopher Davys B.A.; John Vaghan LL.B.;  
 John Gybons LL.B., dean of law; James Pollarde B.A.; John  
 Bedell B.A.; Richard Barber LL.B. In their probationary year:  
 John Procter B.A.; Henry Dawkes B.A.; Giles Caple B.A.;  
 John Watson B.A.; Edward Cratforde B.A.; Matthew Evans,  
 jurist, non-graduate. Chaplains: Francis Parker; William  
 Dowmane. Servants: Christopher Arundell, steward; John  
 Richardes, under-steward; William Harrys; Thomas Hill,  
 librarian;<sup>1</sup> Thomas Mortyboys, Roger Roydon, chapter clerks;  
 John Warren, door keeper; John Joyner, William ..., Roger  
 ...,<sup>2</sup> Edward Pye, cooks.

[<sup>1</sup>... librorum in MS.;      <sup>2</sup>Surnames omitted in MS.]



54F[fol. 42-v.]

Acta before M. Walter Wryght LL.D. in the chapel of All Souls College, Oxford, on Thurs. 12 May, 1541. William Walker presented Wryght with his commission and Wryght ordered that it should be read to the warden and fellows. Wryght then appointed Walker, notary public by royal authority, as scribe. M. John Warner exhibited to Wryght the archbishop's citation and his certificate of execution with a schedule of the names of those cited. Walker summoned all those cited and read these documents aloud. Wryght then pronounced all those absent contumacious and reserved the penalty for the archbishop on 31 May. He then began his visitation and announced that due to pressure of public business, the archbishop was unable to be present. He therefore prorogued the visitation until the Tues. following the feast of the Ascension, 31 May, between 7 am and 8 am in the college chapel.

54G

Mandate from the archbishop to the warden, deputy warden, deans, bursars, fellows and scholars of All Souls College, Oxford. On his recent visitation, the archbishop discovered many enormities which violated their statutes. As successor of Henry Chicheley their founder, the archbishop prescribes injunctions to be kept by the college.

1[fol. 42v.-3] By the statutes of the college, the warden, deputy warden, bursars, fellows and scholars are to attend

services in the chapel. The penalties against offenders are too slender and the detecta and comperta of his visitation have revealed many offenders. Members are henceforth to be present at all offices from the beginning of the service, unless a sufficient reason be approved by the warden, deans and bursars or a majority of them. Members are to be present at matins before the first psalm has ended; at mass, they are to be assembled before the end of Kyrie eleyson; at vespers, before the end of the first psalm; at the offices of the dead before the beginning of the psalm Verba mea auribus. Transgressors are to pay a fine of 4d in addition to that limited by statute. The money is to be paid at the order of the dean of the offender's faculty into the hands of one of the bursars for the use of the college. Should the 4d not be paid within two days, the offender is to pay 2s to one of the bursars by the order of the deputy warden for the use of the college. Should the 2s not be paid within two days, the offender is to pay 4s at the order of the warden for the use of the college. Should the offender not pay the 4s within a week, he is to be permanently expelled from the college and his place is to be reckoned as void from the day he refused to pay the fine of 4s.

2. The warden is to be resident in the college. He is not to be absent for more than sixty days in any year unless on college business or for an approved reason according to statute. The warden may not be allowed to be absent for more than two months, saving on college business according to

statute(except for illness) under pain of perpetual exclusion from office.

3. The fellows and scholars are to obey the warden and their superiors according to statute. The warden, deputy warden and deans are to observe all the statutes faithfully under pain of incurring a penalty to be decided by the archbishop.

4. All factions between fellows and scholars are to cease. Love and concord are to grow in their place, under pain of incurring the penalties laid down in statute.

5. All fellows are to refrain from strife and brawls.

6. The fellows and scholars are to refrain from drunkenness and other enormities at meals.

7[fol. 43-v.] Each dean is to exercise his office faithfully according to statute and particularly at the request of the warden or deputy warden. Should one of the deans refuse to obey such an order, he is to be excluded from commons for one month by the warden or the deputy warden and the second dean in his absence. If he disobeys a second time, he is to be suspended from office. A deputy is to be appointed by the warden, or by the deputy warden in his absence, with the consent of the bursars and the second dean, who is to receive the profits of the office for that year.

8. Each fellow and scholar, at the order of the dean of his faculty, is to be present at the disputations in the college according to statute under pain of exclusion from commons for one week. Each dean is to be ordered by the warden or deputy warden in his absence to supervise the disputations.

Should he refuse to be present, he is to be suspended from his office for that year. A deputy is to be appointed[etc.; of. 7]. No dean is to dissolve the disputations in any faculty before two hours have elapsed, unless they take place on the vigils of feasts in which matins is accustomed to be sung immediately after vespers, under pain of suspension from office by the warden, or the deputy warden in his absence. A deputy is to be appointed[etc.; of. 7].

9. Each fellow is principally to devote his time to the study of the discipline for which he was admitted.

10. Each fellow who is a bachelor of arts and is eligible to become a master of arts according to college and university statutes and who has not taken the degree is to do so at the next congregation under pain of exclusion from college commons until he is thus promoted. In future, all those holding degrees as bachelors of arts are to proceed to the degree of master of arts within the time laid down by college and university statutes, under pain of incurring the penalties expressed in them to be inflicted by the warden, or deputy warden, and the dean of his faculty.

11. All fellows in the college who have not graduated are to assume their due rank before the feast of the birth of Our Lord next[25 Dec.] under pain of exclusion from college commons. In future, each scholar, who is a fellow, is to assume his grade in his faculty according to college statutes under the penalties expressed in them[etc.; of. 10].

12. Thomas Daye(Day), Thomas Kaye(Key), John Howell, William Walker(Walber), Nicholas Alambygg(Alambrigge), William Turnebull, Richard Ryve(Reve), Arthur Pyttes(Pittes) and John Fullar(Fuller), magistri, are to receive priests' orders by Easter next[9 April] and subdeacons' orders by Christmas Day next[25 Dec.] under pain of perpetual expulsion from the college.

13[fol. 44] The warden, deputy warden, fellows and scholars are to wear gowns of ankle-length, plain shirts which are not gathered at the neck or arms or decorated with silk; scholars are to wear suitable clothes and have tonsures according to the custom of the university under pain of expulsion from college commons.

14. The fragments of food left by the fellows, scholars and servants are to be distributed amongst the poor after each meal. This is to be done by the manciple, or in his absence by the bursar's servant, or in his absence by the lector of the Bible, or in his absence by the senior clerk, under pain of a fine of 4d to be paid to one of the bursars.

15. All young boys who have not been admitted as servants into the college are to be thrown out before 1 Oct. next by the warden, or in his absence by the deputy warden, or in his absence by one of the bursars. If one of the fellows, scholars or servants allows a young man to stay in his room at night or attempts to give him food after 1 Oct., he is to be told by the warden, or in his absence by the deputy warden, or in his absence by the dean of his faculty, or in

his absence by the bursar of his faculty, to remove the child within three days under pain of exclusion from college commons for one month. The penalty is to be imposed by the warden, or in his absence by the deputy warden and the dean of the offender's faculty. After three such warnings, the offender is to be expelled.

16. Nothing is to be demanded for food and drink from scholars in their probationary year or from those being admitted as full fellows. There is to be no distinction in their admission to commons, but within ten days of their election, they are to be received in the hall.

17. No fellow is to vacate his position in return for money from his successor, their friends or family.

18. No fellow or scholar is to receive money from anyone being elected as a scholar, or from their friends. The same prescription applies to any scholar being admitted as a fellow. The penalty is perpetual exclusion from the college as soon as the archbishop or his successors, the warden, deputy warden or dean of the offender's faculty is informed.

19[fol. 44-v.] If any fellow or scholar accepts payment for his vote in the leasing of farms, the sale of woods or the right of presentation to benefices, he is to be expelled from the college in perpetuity as soon as the archbishop[etc.; of. 18] is informed.

20. If any fellow promises to help a person seeking a farm or benefice before the warden has put the matter to the vote, he is to lose his vote ea vice as soon as the warden[etc.; of. 18] is informed.

21. The warden and bursars are to give cloth rather than money for the provision of clothes, under pain of incurring a penalty to be decided by the archbishop.

22. No fellow, scholar or servant is to keep a dog after 1 Oct. according to statute.

23. The warden or his officers are not to grant absences from the college for more than two months in one year under pain of incurring a penalty to be decided by the archbishop. Should such leave of absence be granted during the visitation, the archbishop revokes it, save in cases of illness.

24[fols 44v.-5] At certain times and in cases laid down in statute under the rubric Quod in maioribus causis, the Fellows have to make decisions which are agreed unanimously. Should one of the eight senior lawyers not agree, the warden is to examine the reason for his decision despite the fact that the warden and the majority of artists and lawyers are in agreement. The warden, deputy warden and the dean of the lawyers(provided that the deputy warden and dean are not among the objectors) are to examine the dispute. Should the deputy warden and the dean of the lawyers be among the objectors, the cause is to be examined by the warden and the two senior lawyers. If the reason for the lawyer's decision is rejected as frivolous, or if no reason is given, the warden is to order the offender to appear before the archbishop within ten days under pain of perpetual exclusion from the college. If the archbishop approves the reason for his dissent, the objector is to return to the college, which is to pay his expenses. If the archbishop rejects the reason, the objector is



to pay his own expenses and to be deprived from college commons until he gives his assent. If two or three of the eight senior jurists dissent and can give no just reason, they are to be compelled to agree with the majority; this proviso cannot be applied in cases where the number of objectors is more than three.

25. Due to frequent disagreements over the grant of leases for farms, the warden is empowered in disputed cases to grant a lease for one year for the profit of the college. During the year, the warden is to assemble all the fellows in the university whose agreement is necessary to grant the lease. Should there be disagreement once more, the warden is to grant a lease for another year and so on until agreement is reached. The warden may not grant a lease for more than one year under pain of perpetual removal from office.

26[fol. 45-v.] Following the receipt of the injunctions, the warden is to assemble all fellows and scholars of the college within the university in the hall. They are to swear an oath to observe the injunctions faithfully. The deputy warden, bursars and deans are to do likewise. The warden, or in his absence the deputy warden, is to ensure that those who are absent swear the oath within three days of their return. Each new member of the college is to swear the oath. Each fellow or scholar refusing to take the oath is to be deprived. The original text of the injunctions is to be kept in the muniment chest, where the original college statutes are preserved with the common seal. One copy is to remain with the warden.<sup>2</sup>



Another copy is to be inserted in the book of the college statutes in the college library.

Sealed with the great seal. Lambeth, [blank] August, 1541 (33 Henry VIII).

[<sup>1</sup>The mandate and injunctions are transcribed in Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the period of the Reformation, edited in 3 vols for the Alcuin Club by W.P.M. Kennedy and W.H. Frere (London, 1910), vol. II, pp. 70-81.

<sup>2</sup>The stipulation concerning the first copy of the injunctions is omitted in the printed version; cf. ibid., p. 80.]

54H[fols 45v.-6]

Commission to M. John Barbar LL.D., official of the court of Canterbury 'quem sic per presentes nominamus'. Due to pressure of business, the archbishop is unable to visit the college of All Souls, Oxford, 'nostre fundationis et iurisdictionis immediate' on Thurs., 22 April,<sup>1</sup> in the college chapel. Barbar is therefore empowered to visit the college in his place. He is to enquire into the observance of the college statutes and to issue interrogatories to each member of the college, who is to testify on oath how far the statutes of the college are observed, and to punish crimes. If the warden, deputy warden, any fellow or scholar is found guilty, he is to be deprived of his office and removed from the college. Barbar may also issue injunctions and do all else necessary. April[temp. Henry VIII].

[<sup>1</sup>During the twenty years of Cranmer's archiepiscopate, 22 April

fell on a Thurs. in 1535, 1540 and 1546. Cf. Handbook of Dates for Students of English History, edited for The Royal Historical Society by C.R. Cheney (London, 1978), pp. 96 and 152. Barbar died in 1549; his will was proved on 20 July. Cf. A.B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford 1501-1540 (Oxford, 1974), p. 23]

[The remainder of the fol. and fol. 46v. are blank]

55[fol. 47-v.]

Letters testimonial, attested by M. Anthony Huse, notary public by royal authority in the diocese of London and the archbishop's principal registrar, concerning a visitation made by Arthur [Bulkeley], bishop of Bangor (Bangor', Bangorie), who has notified the archbishop that during a recent visitation of his diocese he found many things in need of redress. Many rectors and vicars withhold from him procurations and other payments 'tam de iure quam de consuetudine in eadem diocese supra hominum memoria inconcusse usitata et observata'. The cathedral church of Bangor is owed certain annual payments from monasteries and priories, now suppressed, which possessed appropriated benefices. Because of the negligence of previous bishops and the keepers of their registers, such sums cannot now be determined. Since the annual payments and pensions due to the bishop and his cathedral church can be assessed from the archiepiscopal archives, which have been well preserved, and information gained concerning the vicarages and chantries of the diocese and the names, titles and tenure of the incumbents, the bishop of

Bangor has requested that he might be allowed to examine the archiepiscopal archives, which are in the custody of Anthony Huse. The archbishop, wishing that the rights of the bishop of Bangor and his cathedral should not be eroded through the inadequacy of his registers, has ordered Huse to examine the archiepiscopal archives. The register of William Wharham, the archbishop's predecessor, reveals that during the vacancy in the see caused by the death of Thomas Clivus<sup>1</sup> the archbishop as keeper of the spiritualities of the see performed a visitation of the city and diocese. An accurate record of the visitation beginning 'Acta habita etc.' has been copied from Wharham's register [not recorded in Thomas Cranmer's register].<sup>2</sup> Lambeth, 20 April 1543 (34 Henry VIII).

[<sup>1</sup>I.e. Thomas Pigot, who died on 15 Aug. 1504; cf. H.B.C., p. 275. <sup>2</sup>For the compotus recording the fees due to the archbishop during his administration of the see of Bangor sede vacante following Pigot's death, cf. L.P.L., W.R., fols 220v.-21v.]

# 56

Licence to Thomas Saunder esq. of Charlwood (Charlewoode) in Croydon deanery, to his household and his heirs to have a chaplain for a private chapel, built a long time ago, in his mansion there, provided that the rector of Charlwood agree and that nothing prejudicial be done to the tithes and offerings of the church. The licence is for divine offices, the sacraments of Eucharist, penance and baptism, provided that the font be not fixed, and for the purification of women after

childbirth. The chapel may also have a bell to summon the household to services. It is granted due to the distance of the house from the church and the difficulty of travel, especially in winter. Lambeth, 23 Feb. 1543.

57[fols 47v.-8v.]

Commission from 'THOMAS PERMISSIONE DIVINA CANTUAR' archiepiscopus,  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus ad quem, mediante  
suprema auctoritate illustrissimi in Christo principis et  
domini nostri domini Henrici octavi etc., omnis et omnimoda  
iurisditio spiritualis et ecclesiastica que ad episcopum  
Cicestrensem sede plena pertinuit, ipsa sede iam per translationem  
venerabilis confratris nostri domini Richardi Sampson<sup>1</sup> nuper  
episcopi ecclesie cathedralis Cicestrensis iam vacante et  
dudum ad ecclesiam cathedralem Lich' per mortem naturalem bone  
memorie domini Rolandi Lee<sup>2</sup> ultimi episcopi et pastoris ibidem  
vacantem rite electi, postulati ac per nos de mandato dicti  
domini nostri Regis confirmati...pertinere notorie dinoscitur'  
 to M. John Worthiall, archdeacon of Chichester, as keeper of  
 the spirituality sede vacante. He is empowered to visit the  
 cathedral, hospitals and colleges and the clergy and people  
 of the diocese, to sequester the fruits of benefices and to  
 appoint sequestrators; to celebrate synods; to institute and  
 induct clerks into benefices and to enquire into reasons for  
 resignation or permutation; to enquire into the appropriation  
 of benefices or those receiving pensions and to enforce residence

on the incumbents; to prove the wills of those who die in the diocese during visitation, where probate belongs to the bishop or others, and to administer the goods of those who die intestate; to inhibit all inferior clergy during visitation; to receive all emoluments due during the vacancy and to punish those who refuse to pay,<sup>3</sup> and to do all else necessary. M. Anthony Huse, notary public, the archbishop's principal registrar, or his deputy is to be scribe. When the see is full, Worthiall is to give a copy of the acta to Huse for the archbishop's register. Lambeth [blank] day of [none given], 1540.

[<sup>1</sup>Sampson was elected as bishop of Coventry and Lichfield on 19 Feb. 1543. His election was confirmed by the archbishop on 9 March. Cf. H.B.C., p. 234. <sup>2</sup>Lee died on 25 Jan. 1543. Cf. B. Jones, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541, 12 vols, vol X, p. 3 <sup>3</sup>alium insuper seu alios in premissis et eorum quolibet dictarum civitatis et diocesis prout vobis melius visum fuerit committendum in MS.; meaning unclear.]

58[fols 48v.-9]

[18 June, 1544. Mandate to the bishop of London ordering the publication of the royal injunctions and the use of the English litany according to the tenor of royal letters missive]

THOMAS permissione divina etc. illustrissimi in

Christo principis et domini nostri domini Henrici octavi Dei  
 gracia Anglie, Francie et Hibernie Regis, fidei defensoris ac  
 in terra ecclesie Anglicane et Hibernice supremi capitis  
 auctoritate legitime fulcitus VENERABILI confratri nostro  
 domino Edmundo eadem permissione London' episcopo, salutem  
 et fraternam in Domino charitatem. Litteras supradicti  
 inviotissimi domini nostri Regis manu sua signatas et signeto  
 suo obsignatas nobis inscriptas et ad nos datas nuper debitis  
 cum honore et reverencia accepimus tenorem subsequentem  
 complectentes:

MOSTE reverende father in God, right trustie and  
 right welbeloved, we grete youe well and let youe witte that,  
 callinge to oure remembraunce the miserable state of all  
 Christendom, beinge at this present besydes all other troubles  
 so plaged wythe moste cruell warres, hatreddes and discentions  
 as no peace of the same almoste (beinge thole redused to a very  
 narrowe corner) remayneth in good peax, agreement and concorde  
 (thelpe and remedie whereof, farre exceedinge the power of any  
 man, muste be called for of Hym whoo onely is able to graunte  
 oure petitions and never forsaketh ne repelleth any that  
 firmly beleve and faythfully oall on<sup>1</sup> Hym, unto whome also  
 the examples of Scripture encoragethe us in all thies and other  
 oure troubles and necessities to flie and to crye for ayde and  
 succor); beinge therefore resolved to have continually from  
 hensforthe generall processions in all cities, townes, churches  
 and parishes of this oure realme sayde and songe wythe soche

reverence and devotion as appertayneth, forasmoche as heretofore the people, partely for lacke of goode instruction and callinge on, partly for that they understode no parte of soche prayers or suffrages as were used to be songe and sayde, have used to come very slackely to the procession when the same have bene commaunded heretofore, WEE HAVE setforthe certayne godly[fol. 49] prayers and suffrages inoure native Englyshe tonge<sup>2</sup> whiche we sende youe herewythe, signifyinge unto youe that for the speciall truste and confidence we have of oure godly mynde and earenest deasire to the settinge forwarde of the glorie of God and the true worshippinge of His most holy name wythin that province committed by us unto youe, we have sent unto youe thies suffrages, not to be for a monethe or twoo observed and after slenderly considered as other oure iniunctions have to oure no litle mervayle bene used, but to thintent that aswell the same as other oure iniunctions may earenestly be setforthe by preachinge, good exhortations and otherwayes to the people in soche sorte as they<sup>3</sup> fealinge the godly taste thereof may godly and ioyously wythe thanks receyve, embrace and frequent the same as apperteynethe.

WHEREFORE we wyll and commaunde youe, as youe wyll aunswere unto us for the contrary, not onely to cause thies prayers and suffrages aforesayde to be publyshed, frequented and openly used in all townes, churches, villages and parryshes of youre owne dioces, but also to signifie this oure pleasure unto all other bysshoppes of youre province, willinge



and commaunding them in oure name and by vertue hereof to do and execute the same accordingly. Unto whose proceedinges in the execution of this oure commaundement we wyll that youe have a speciall respecte and make reporte unto us if any shall not wythe good dexteritie accomplysse the same, not faylinge as oure speciall trust is in youe.

YEAVEN undre oure signet at oure mannor of Saint James the eleventhe of June the xxxvi yeare of oure reigne. In capite vero eorundem sic scriptum est: By the Kynge. Inscriptio autem hec est: To the moste reverende father in God, oure right trustie and right welbeloved counsaylor tharchebysshop of Canterbury.

NOS VERO pro nostra erga suam celsitudinem observantia toto pectore affectantes litteris et mandatis suis regis(uti decet) obtemperare, volentesque pro debito nostri officii omnem curam et solertem nostram in commissis et demandatis a sua maiestate adhibere diligentiam, vobis pro parte sue regie maiestatis tenore presentium mandamus et precipiendo iniungimus quatenus receptis presentibus non solum iniunctiones<sup>4</sup> omnes regias ad sacrosanctam religionem firmandam et stabiliendam antehac per auctoritatem regiam promulgatas cum omni reverencia observandas edicatis et mandetis, verum etiam omni sedulitate ac celeritate accomodis sancta haec suffragia et salubres orationes, quarum unum exemplar presentibus annexum vobis per latorem presentium mittimus, tum quidem in omnibus et singulis ecclesiis cathedralibus, collegiatis et perochialibus per diocesim et iurisdictionem vestras London' ubilibet sitis



et existentibus, tum etiam ab omnibus et singulis aliis  
coepiscopis et confratribus nostris, nostre Cantuariensis  
provinciae suffraganeis, ubilibet locorum per dioceses et  
iurisdictiones suas iuxta et secundum litterarum regiarum  
suprascriptarum tenorem et continentiam in omnibus et per  
omnia exponi, declarari, denunciari, cantari, dici, publicari  
et observari facias et faciant et fieri sedulo procures et  
procurent.

IN CUIUS rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus  
est impensum. Dat' decimo octavo die<sup>5</sup> mensis Junii anno  
Domini millesimo quingentesimo quadragesimo quarto et nostre  
consecrationis anno duodecimo.

[<sup>1</sup>on written above unto, which is struck through. <sup>2</sup>The English  
litany of 1544 is found in F.E. Brightman, The English Rite,  
2 vols, 2nd rev. ed.(Farnborough, 1970), I, pp. 174-91.  
<sup>3</sup>the in MS. <sup>4</sup>For the text of the injunctions, cf. Gee and  
Hardy, Documents, pp. 269-81. <sup>5</sup>ootavo in MS., but of. U.L.C.,  
E.D.R., G/1/7, fols 164-5v.]

59A[fols 49-50]

The like to the archdeacon of Canterbury. The archbishop  
instructs him first to publish all the royal injunctions and the  
suffrages in Canterbury cathedral and then in collegiate and  
parish churches in the city, diocese and jurisdictions[Undated].

59B

EMANARUNT consimiles littere decano decanatum de Shorham,  
Croydon, Bockynge, Pagham, Terringe, Risburgh et Sowthmallynge  
neon commissario ville et merchiarum Caleti pro executione  
litterarum huiusmodi mutandis verbis sequentibus VOBIS pro  
parte sue regie maiestatis tenore presentium mandamus et  
preciendo iniungimus quatenus receptis presentibus etc.

60A[fols 50-v.]

Commission to M. Robert Peterson, dean of the collegiate church  
of South Malling reciting a writ de inquirendo. Teste John  
Baudwyn, Rt, dated at East Grinstead(Estgrenstede, Estgrensted)  
on the Wed. after the feast of the apostles SS Peter and Paul,  
34 Henry VIII[5 July, 1542] Browne, concerning the case  
of Thomas Bocher[cf. 17]. The dean is to go to the chapel  
of Uckfield(Tuckfelde, Tuckefielde) annexed to the parish  
church of Burted(also Bursted, Burstede) and to summon before  
him the curate, parish clerk or water clerk and a competent  
number of parishoners to enquire whether Thomas Bocher  
married in the chapel of Uckfield or in the parish church  
of Burted Maud Hellywell, widow, and knew her carnally, and  
whether he is bigamous. The archbishop is to be certified of  
his findings under pain of displeasure by 30 May. Lambeth,  
20 April 1543.

[Cf. 17 and 18A-B]

60B[fols 50v.-1]

Inquisition held on 20 May 1543 in the chapel of Uckfield  
 (Uokfelde, Uokefelde, Wickefelde) before M. Henry Marshall,  
 deputy of Robert Otes, commissary of South Malling, acting on  
 a commission from the archbishop. The witnesses from Uckfield  
 are: Thomas Martyn, curate, an inhabitant for four years  
 and who has known Bocher during that time, has nothing  
 to depose; Thomas Taylor, parish clerk, an inhabitant from  
 childhood, aged 65; William Day, an inhabitant for thirty  
 years, aged 50 and above, who has known Bocher for eight  
 years; Thomas Snat, an inhabitant for twenty years, aged 36,  
 who has known Bocher for ten years; John Woode, an inhabitant  
 since childhood, aged 36, who has known Bocher for eight  
 years; John Anfray, an inhabitant since childhood, aged 60, who  
 has known Bocher for ten years; John Adroll, an inhabitant from  
 childhood, aged 60, who has known Bocher for more than eight  
 years; James Athothe, an inhabitant for twenty years, aged  
 30, who has known Bocher for ten years. They depose that Bocher,  
 late of Uckfield, 'was married wythin one of the monthes of May,  
June and Julie in the xxviii<sup>th</sup> or xxix<sup>th</sup> yere of...our  
soveraigne...in the chapell of Uokefelde wythin the parish of  
Buxted by sir Rycharde Morpethe, then curate, unto one Maude  
Holywell, wydowe, the verie day of mariage is to us uncertayne'  
 and that they had lived together in Buxted as man and wife for  
 two years. If marriage to a widow makes a man bigamous, Bocher  
 is guilty of bigamy.

600[fol. 51-v.]

Signification of the same to the crown, by which Bocher is declared bigamous. Lambeth 11 June, 35 Henry VIII[1543]

61

Commission at the archbishop's pleasure to M. John Cockes, LL.D., as official of the court of Canterbury. He is to rescribe in all appeals and causes brought before the court, examining the parties 'circa offensa legum et statutorum dicti regni', and to do all else necessary. Croydon, 22 July 1543.

[The remainder of fol. 51v. and fols 52-v. are blank]

62[fol. 53]

11 August 1541. Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury concerning the execution of a writ of certiorari from the court of first fruits and tenths]

THOMAS ETC. DILECTO nobis in Christo archidiacono nostro Cantuariensi aut eius officiali, salutem, gratiam et benedictionem. Breve supradicti metuendissimi domini nostri Regis unacum articulis eidem annexis nobis directum nuper cum ea qua decuit reverencia accepimus tenorem subsequentem in se continens:

HENRICUS octavus Dei gracia Anglie, Francie Rex,

fidei defensor, Dominus Hibernie ac in terra supremum caput  
 Anglicane ecclesie reverendissimo in Christo patri Thome  
 archiepiscopo Cantuariensi salutem. VOLENTESQUE certis  
 de causis certiorari de et super quibusdam articulis presentibus  
 annexis, VOBIS mandamus quod de veritate eorundem nos in  
 curia nostra primorum fructuum et decimarum<sup>1</sup> in octavis  
 Sancti Michaelis proximis futuris sub sigillo vestro reddatis  
 certiores, remittentes nobis in curia predicta articulos  
 predictos unacum hoc breve. TESTE Johanne Baker milite apud  
 Westm' vicesimo quarto die Junii anno regni nostri tricesimo  
 tertio;

FURSTE to certifie how many benefices or other  
 spirituall dignitis and promotions have<sup>2</sup> been voyde within  
 your diocese or jurisdiction, the names of them and every  
 of them, how longe they have been voyde, of whos presentation,  
 nomination or donation they and every of them have<sup>2</sup> been and  
 the names of them and every of them that have perceived and  
 taken the meane profectes of the said promotions sins the  
 laste becuming void of the same dignitie or benefice. ITEM  
 to certifie aswell the name and names of all such parson and  
 parsons as have been collated, institute or inducte in any  
 promotion spirituall within your diocese or jurisdiction since  
 the feaste of the nativitie of Saint John Baptiste which was  
 in the reigne of our souveraigne lorde the Kinge that now is  
 the xxxi<sup>nd</sup> unto the same feaste next following as the name  
 and names of all and every such promotion where unto any  
 parson hath been collated, institute or inducte from the said

feaste of Saint John Baptiste in the xxxii<sup>nd</sup> yere<sup>3</sup> abovesaid unto the same feaste next following, as also the name of the countie where the same promotion doth lye.

NOS eiusdem domini nostri Regis mandatis pro officii nostri erga suam maiestatem debito parere et omni subiectionis honore obedire(uti par est) volentes, cupientesque de omnibus et singulis articulis suprascriptis et in eis contentis et comprehensis quibuscunque mature fieri certiores VOBIS pro parte sue regie maiestatis tenore presentium distriote precipiendo mandamus quatenus cum ea qua poteritis celeritate et diligentia de et super articulis premissis et in eis declaratis quibuscunque maturam et sedulam<sup>4</sup> faciatis apud singulas ecclesias infra diocesim nostram Cantuariensem ubilibet constitutas, modo et via quibus melius et efficacius poteritis, inquisitionem pariter et indagationem, reddentes nos de omni eo quod in hac parte per vos fuerit compertum et inquisitum certiores per literas vestras patentes autentice sigillatas tenorem presentium et totum et integrum processum<sup>6</sup> vestram, inquisitionem et indagationem vestram in se continentes; et hoc sub pena contemptus nostri et prout eidem domino nostro Regi in hac parte sub periculo vestro respondere volueritis facere et sedulo exequi curetis et fieri causetis indilate.

IN CUIUS rei etc. DATUM in manerio nostro de Lambeth undecimo die Augusti anno 1541 et nostre consecrationis nono.<sup>7</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>The court of first fruits and tenths was formally erected in 1540. Cf. Stat. Realm, III, pp. 798-801. <sup>2</sup>have omitted in MS.

<sup>3</sup>In both instances, the regnal year is given as xxxi<sup>th</sup> in MS.

<sup>4</sup>A blank space follows sedulam in MS. <sup>5</sup>et omitted in MS.

<sup>6</sup>processium in MS. <sup>7</sup>Printed in P.S., Cranmer II, p. 489. A marginal note in the MS. indicates that the above mandate was given to M. John Blande of Adisham on 19 Aug. in order that he might deliver it to the official of the archdeacon of Canterbury]

63[fols 53v.-4v.]

[20 December 1543. Signification to the court of first fruits and tenths of the values of newly erected bishoprics and of the offices in Christ Church Canterbury made according to the terms of a subsidy made to the crown in convocation and confirmed by act of parliament]

SPECTABILI ET HONORANDO VIRO Johanni Baker militi  
curie primitiarum et decimarum illustrissimo et invictissimo  
in Christo principi et domino nostro domino Henrico octavo  
Dei gracia Anglie, Francie et Hibernie Regi, fidei defensori et  
in terris ecclesie Anglicane et Hibernice supremo capiti  
imperpetuo debitarum<sup>1</sup> cancellario et aliis eiusdem curie  
officialibus THOMAS permissione divina Cantur' archiepiscopus,  
totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus salutem, gratiam et  
benedictionem.

VESTRIS prudentiis harum serie significamus et  
intimamus quod iuxta et secundum vim, formam et effectum eiusdem  
actus concessionis voluntarii subsidii eidem domino nostro Regi



a nobis prelati et clero nostre Cantuariensis provincie  
in sinode Cantuariensi de mandato eiusdem potentissimi domini  
nostri Regis dudum celebrato<sup>2</sup> ac auctoritate sublimis  
parliamenti<sup>3</sup> huius regni sui Anglie anno regni sui felicissimi  
tricesimo quarto apud Westm' inchoati et successive ibidem  
anno eiusdem sui regni prorogati et continuati, approbati,  
confirmati et correberati nos non solum diligentem et solertem  
fecimus inquisitionem de vero valore annuarum reventionum  
omnium et singulorum episcoporum noviter a sua excellenti  
maiestate infra nostram Cantuariensem provinciam erectorum,  
fundatorum et dotatorum verum etiam certum et indubitatum  
valorem omnium et singulorum reventionum et proficiorum  
annuorum decani, prebendariorum, minorum canonicorum et  
predicatorum in ecclesia nostra metropolitana Christi  
Cantuariensi a sua maiestate regia noviter seu dudum erectorum,  
fundatorum et dotatorum indagavimus et sedulo perscrutati  
sumus eaque sub modo et forma subscriptis pro veris singulatis<sup>4</sup>  
duximus vobis significanda: VIDELICET QUOD verus<sup>5</sup> et integer ac  
perfectus valor sive estimatio omnium et singulorum proventuum,  
emolumentorum et reventionum venerabilis confratris nostri  
domini Thome Thurlebey episcopi Westm' tam in spiritualibus  
quam in temporalibus ad summam quingentarum septuaginta et trium  
librarum<sup>6</sup> ac quinque solidorum sex denariorum unius obuli et  
unius quadrantis sterlingorum et non ultra annuatim et singulis  
annis se extendit. ITEM quod verus et integer valor annuus  
omnium proventuum et aliorum emolumentorum venerabilis confratris



nostri domini Johannis Wakeman episcopi Glocestrensis tam in  
 spiritualibus quam temporalibus annuatim sive singulis  
 annis ad summam trecentarum quindecim librarum septem solidorum  
 et duorum denariorum se extendit et non ultra. ITEM quod  
 valor[etc.] domini Johannis Chamber episcopi Petriburgensis[etc.]  
 annuatim ad summam quatuor centum et decem librarum undecim  
 solidorum duorum denariorum unius obuli et ...<sup>7</sup> quadrantis et  
 non ultra se extendit; ITEM verus et integer valor[etc.]  
 domini Pauli Busshe episcopi Bristolinensis[etc.] ad summam  
 trecentarum octoginta trium librarum octo solidorum quatuor  
 denariorum unius obuli et unius quadrantis et non ultra se  
 extendit; ITEM quod verus valor[etc.] domini Roberti episcopi  
 Oxoniensis[etc.] ad summam trecentarum quinquaginta quatuor  
 librarum sexdecim solidorum trium denariorum et unius  
 quadrantis sterlingorum et non ultra annuatim se extendit,  
 prout per literas dictorum confratrum nostrorum nobis in hac  
 parte transmissas et eorum sigillis respective sigillatas  
 liquide constat.

ITEM verus et integer valor dignitatis decanalis  
 in ecclesia nostra Christi Cantur' quam Nicholas Wotton  
 legum doctor obtinet in spiritualibus et temporalibus ad summam  
 trecentarum librarum singulis annis et non ultra se extendit.  
 ITEM quod prebenda Richardi Thorneden primi canonici sive[fol. 54]  
 prebendarii<sup>8</sup> in eadem ecclesia est valoris anni quadraginta  
 librarum et non ultra; ITEM prebenda Arthuri Sayntleger secundi  
 canonici[etc.] quadraginta librarum et non ultra; ITEM prebenda  
 Richardi Parkehurst tertii canonici[etc.] quadraginta librarum

et non ultra; ITEM prebenda Nicholai Riddleley quarti prebendarii  
 [etc.] quadraginta librarum et non ultra; ITEM prebenda sive  
 canonicatus Johannis Menis quinti canonici [etc.] quadraginta  
 librarum et non ultra; ITEM prebenda Hugonis Glasior sexti  
 prebendarii [etc.] quadraginta librarum et non ultra; ITEM  
 prebenda Willelmi<sup>8</sup> Hunt septimi prebendarii [etc.] quadraginta  
 librarum et non ultra; ITEM quod prebenda Willelmi<sup>9</sup> Gardener  
 octavi prebendarii [etc.] quadraginta librarum et non ultra;  
 ITEM quod prebenda sive canonicatus Johannis Milles noni  
 canonici [etc.] quadraginta librarum et non ultra; ITEM quod  
 prebenda Johannis Daniell decimi canonici [etc.] quadraginta  
 librarum et non ultra; ITEM quod prebenda Roberti Goldeson  
 undecimi canonici [etc.] quadraginta librarum et non ultra; ITEM  
 quod prebenda Johannis Baptiste<sup>10</sup> nuper mortui duodecimi et  
 ultimi canonici [etc.] quadraginta librarum et non ultra.<sup>11</sup>

ITEM quod officium sive portio Roberti Serles primi  
 concionatoris in dicta ecclesia est annui valoris viginti  
 librarum et non ultra; ITEM officium sive portio Michaelis  
 Drumme secundi concionatoris [etc.] viginti librarum et non  
 ultra; ITEM officium sive portio Launceloti Riddely tertii  
 concionatoris [etc.] viginti librarum et non ultra; ITEM  
 officium sive portio Johannis Skoery quarti concionatoris [etc.]  
 viginti librarum et non ultra; ITEM officium sive portio  
 Edmundi Shetheir quinti concionatoris [etc.] viginti librarum et  
 non ultra; ITEM quod officium sive portio Thome Broke sexti et  
 ultimi concionatoris [etc.] viginti librarum et non ultra.

ITEM portio Willelmi Windechepe primi minoris canonici

in eadem ecclesia est valoris annui decem librarum et non  
 ultra; ITEM portio Johannis Newbury secundi minoris canonici[etc.]  
 decem librarum et non ultra; ITEM portio Willelmi Cockes tertii  
 minoris canonici[etc.] decem librarum et non ultra; ITEM portio  
 Johannis Salisbury quarti minoris canonici[etc.] decem librarum  
 et non ultra; ITEM portio Johannis Charte quinti minoris  
 canonici[etc.] decem librarum et non ultra; ITEM portio  
 Willelmi<sup>12</sup> Austen sexti minoris canonici[etc.] decem librarum  
 et non ultra; ITEM portio Thome Ioham septimi minoris canonici  
 [etc.] decem librarum et non ultra; ITEM portio Bartholomei  
 Otforde octavi minoris canonici[etc.] decem librarum et non  
 ultra; ITEM portio Thome Ancellme noni minoris canonici[etc.]  
 decem librarum et non ultra; ITEM portio Henrici Awdoen decimi  
 minoris canonici[etc.] decem librarum et non ultra; ITEM  
 portio Johannis Hawke undecimi minoris canonici[etc.] decem  
 librarum et non ultra; ITEM portio Johannis Busbye duodecimi  
 et ultimi minoris canonici[etc.] decem librarum et non ultra  
 prout per litteras dictorum decani et capituli sigillo illorum  
 capitulari nobis in hac parte destinatas liquet.

IN QUORUM omnium et singulorum fidem et testimonium  
 premissorum huic presenti nostro certificatorio valores  
 episcopatum, decanatus, prebendariorum, predicatorum et minorum  
 canonicorum suprascriptorum respective continenti<sup>13</sup> sigillum  
 nostrum presentibus apponi fecimus. DATUM in manerio nostro  
 de[fol. 54v.] Lambeth vicesimo die mensis Decembris anno  
 Domini millesime quingentesimo quadragesimo tertio<sup>14</sup> et nostre  
 consecrationis anno undecimo.

<sup>1</sup>debitorum in MS.    <sup>2</sup>celebrate in MS.    <sup>3</sup>Cf. Stat. Realm. III, pp. 951-3.    <sup>4</sup>sigulatin in MS.    <sup>5</sup>veris in MS.    <sup>6</sup>librarum added as a correction in MS.    <sup>7</sup>MS. unclear; properly unius?  
<sup>8</sup>pre[fol. 54] prebendarii in MS.    <sup>9</sup>Willimi in MS.  
<sup>10</sup>A blank space follows Baptiste in MS.    <sup>11</sup>Elsewhere, the names of the canons at this date are given as: (1) Richard Thornden or le Stede; (2) Arthur Seyntleger; (3) Robert Goldstone; (4) Richard Parkehurst; (5) Nicholas Ridley; (6) John Menys; (7) Hugh Glasyer; (8) William Hunt or Hadley; (9) William Gardiner or Sandwich; (10) John Mylles or Warham; (11) John Daniel or Chillenden; (12) John Baptist de Casia. Cf J.M. Horn, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1541-1857, vol. III (London, 1974), pp 17-40.    <sup>12</sup>Willimi in MS.    <sup>13</sup>contenti in MS.  
<sup>14</sup>tertio repeated and struck through in MS.]

## 64

Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury reciting a writ of certiorari in Latin and English from the court of first fruits and tenths, Teste John Baker Kt, dated at Westminster 6 May, 37 Henry VIII[1545] Godfray, returnable by the quindene of St Michael[12 Oct.]. The archbishop is to ascertain[cf. 62; with the writ specifying diocese, the period given as the feast of the nativity of St John Baptist, 35 Henry VIII[24 June, 1543] to the feast of the birth of our Lord God, 36 Henry VIII[25 Dec., 1544] and a demand for the date of institution]. The archbishop orders the archdeacon[cf. 62] and to certify him of his actions before the feast of St Michael[29 Sept.]. Lambeth, 1 June 1545.

65[fol. 54v.-5]

Circular letter in English, sealed with the signet, stating that due to charges sustained in the defence of the realm, the King and council desire the clergy to pay the tenth and subsidy due at the feast of the Nativity[25 Dec.] before the 31 July. The addressee is to act as an example to the clergy in the diocese. Such payment will acquit the clergy from the next due and ensure that the rates of payment are not increased. Greenwich(Grenewyche). 7 June, 37 Henry VIII[1545].<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Calendared in L.P., XX, i, 882]

66[fol. 55-v.]

[18 Dec. 1547. Letter to the dean and chapter of St Paul's, London. ordering a sermon to be read and the English litany and Te Deum to be sung as a thanksgiving for victory over the Scots]

AFTER OURE RIGHT HARTIE COMMENDATIONS. Where it hathe pleased Almightye Godde to sende the Kinge's maiestie soche victorie against the Skottes as was almoste above the expectation of manne and soche as hathe not bene hard of in anie partes of christendomme this manie yeares(in whiche victorie above the nomber of fiftene thowsande Scottes be slayne, twoo thowsande takenne prisoners and amonge theme manie noble menne and others of goode reputation, all there ordenaunce and baggage of their

campe also wonne frome theme), the Kinge's maiestie wythe the  
advise of his highnes' privie counsaile presentlie attendinge  
upon his maiestie's moste royall parsonne, well knowinge this  
as all other goodnesse to be the giftes of Godde, hathe and  
so dothe accompte it and therefore renderithe unto Hym thonellie  
glorie and prayse for the same; and so hathe willed me not  
onellie in his maiestie's cathedrall churche and other  
churches of my diocesse to gyve thanks to Almighty Godde,  
but also to require in his name<sup>1</sup> all other bysshopes of the  
province of Canterburie to doo or cause to be done semblablie  
in there cures. Whiche his maiestie's pleasure I have thought  
goode to signifie unto youe, requiringe youe not onellie to  
cause a sermonne to be made in youre cathedrall churche the  
next hollydaye after receipte hereof, declaringe the goodnesse  
of Godde and exhortinge the people to faythe and amendment  
of lyf and to gyve thanks to Godde for this victorie, but  
also at the same tyme immediatellie after the sermon and in  
presence of the mayor, aldermenne and other the citesynnes of  
the citie of Londonne to cause the precession in Englyshe and  
To Deum to be openlie and devoutellie songe, and that youe do  
also cause the lyke ordre to be gyven in every parishe churche  
of your diocesse upon some holliday whenne the paryshoners  
shalbe there present wythe as moche spede as youe may, not  
faylinge as youe tender his maiestie's pleasure. Thus fare  
youe hartellie well.

From Otelandes the eightenethe day of December<sup>2</sup> the  
yeare of oure Lord Godde a thowsande fyve[fol. 55v.] hundrethe

fortie and sevenne. Youre lovinge friende Thomas Cantuariensis.  
 The counselle's pleasure is youe shall see this executed on  
 Tuesday nexte. To the deane and chapitor of Saint Paule in  
 Londonne this be geven in haste.<sup>3</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>to require repeated in MS. <sup>2</sup>Properly September? The victory  
 of the English over the Scots at the battle of Pinkey occurred  
 in that month. Cf. M.L. Bush, The Government Policy of  
Protector Somerset (London, 1975), p. 12. <sup>3</sup>Dr Alexander  
 has shown that Bonner was summoned before the privy council  
 on 12 Sept. 1547 for showing resistance to the royal supremacy.  
 He was at liberty again before 27 Sept. He was released on  
 bail for a few weeks. By 23 Oct., he was entirely free and  
 his bail discharged. Cf. G.M.W. Alexander, The Life and Career  
of Edmund Bonner Bishop of London until his deprivation in  
1549 (Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree,  
 university of London, 1960), pp. 436-8. The eighteenth  
 century marginal heading, which gives the addressee as the  
 bishop of London, is incorrect.]

67

[Undated. Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury reciting  
letters missive from the privy council ordering parish churches  
not to alienate goods and to pray for peace]

THOMAS etc. PREDILECTO NOBIS IN Christo archidiacono  
 nostro Cantuariensi seu eius officiali cuicumque salutem, gratiam  
 et benedictionem. Litteras missivas prudentissimorum et  
 sagacissimorum dominorum privati consilii illustrissimi et  
 invictissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri domini  
 Edwardi sexti etc. nobis directas nuper recepimus tenorem  
 subsequentem in se complectentes:



AFTER OURE right hartie commendations. Whereas we are informed that the churche wardens and the perochians of dyvers parishes dothe alienate and sell a way there chalices, crosses of silver, belles and other ornamentes of the churche (whiche were not gyvenne for that purpose to be alienated at there pleasure, but eyther to be used to thentent that they were first gevenne or to some other necessarie and convenient service of the churche), therefore this is to will and require youe immediatelie upon the sight hereof to gyve streight charge and commandment on the Kynge's maiestie's behalf to everie paryshe churche wythin youre dioces that they do in nowyse sell, gyve or otherwyse alienate anie belles or other ornament or iuell belonginge unto youre perishe churche, upon payne of his highnes' displeasure and as they will aunswere to the contrarie at there perill. Thus fare youe well.

From Westm' the laste day of Aprill 1548. Your  
 lovinge friendes: T. Somersett, W. Seintjohn, J. Russell,  
 H. Arrundell, Thomas Cheyne, Willyam Paget, Thomas Smythe,  
 A. Denny, W. Herbert, John Baker. To oure verae goode lorde  
 the archbysshope of Canterburie.

VOBIS IGITUR pro parte sue excellentissime regie  
 maiestatis tenore presentium districto precipiendo mandamus  
 quatenus receptis presentibus omnia et singula contenta et  
 descripta in literis supramentionatis universis et singulis  
 rectoribus, vicariis et quaruncumque ecclesiarum perochialium  
 nostre diocesis<sup>1</sup> curatis<sup>2</sup> significetis et mandetis quatenus omni  
 die dominica et festiva unacum plebe cure sue commisa pie,



cincere, devote et in commune cunctipotenti Deo supplicant  
 quatenus pacem et concordiam suas regie maiestati et hinc  
 suis regis concedere, elargire et conservare dignetur iuxta  
 et secundum prescriptam quandam orationem desuper confectam  
 vobis cum presentibus transmissam, quam loco et vice unius  
 collectarum in regia processione descriptarum publice imitari,  
 legi et cantari volumus. ET QUID etc. IN CUIUS REI etc.

[<sup>1</sup>diocis in MS.      <sup>2</sup>Corrected in MS. from curatiis]

68

[6 May, 1548. Letters missive from the privy council ordering  
 prayers for victory]

AFTER OUR HARTIE COMMENDATIONS TO YOUR goode lordshippe,  
 hearinge tell of greate preparation made of forayne princes, and  
 otherwyse beinge enforced for the procurement and continuance  
 of peax to make preparation of warre, forsomuche as all power and  
 aide valayble comithe of Godde(the whiche He grauntethe, as He  
 hathe promised by His holie worde, by nothinge somoche as by  
 hartie prayer of goode menne, the whiche is also of more  
 efficacie made of an hole congregation togither gathered in  
 His holie name), therefore this is to will and require youe  
 to gyve advertisement and commandement to all the curates in  
 youre diocese that everie Sondag and holy day in there commonne  
 prayer thay make devoute and hartie intercession to almightie

God for victorie and peace. And to thentente that youe sholde not be in doubte whatte sorte and manner thereof we do lyke, we have sent unto youe one, the whiche we wolde that youe and they sholde folowe and rede<sup>1</sup> in stede of one of the collettes of the Kinge's maiestie's procession. Thus wee pray youe not to fayle to do wythe all spede and bid youe farewell.

From Westm' the vi<sup>th</sup> of May 1548. Yourre lovinge friendes: T. Somersett, R. Ryoche, cancellarius, W. Seintjohn, J. Russell, Thomas Cheyney. To oure veraye goode lorde the archbissshop of Canterburie.

[<sup>1</sup>rede it in MS.]

69[fol. 55v.-6v.]

[14 Feb. 1550. Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury reciting letters missive from the King and council. The archdeacon is to ensure that all Roman service books are surrendered to the archbishop]

THOMAS PERMISSIONE DIVINA Cantuariensis archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus per illustrissimum et invictissimum in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum Edwardum sextum Dei gracia Anglie, Francie et Hibernie Regem, etc. ad infrascripta sufficienter et legitime fulcitus dilecto filio archidiacono nostro Cantuariensi seu eius officiali salutem, graciam et benedictionem. LITERAS missivas dioti metuendissimi

domini Regis signatas et nominibus honorabilium virorum  
 dominorum consiliariorum suorum in calce earundem subscriptas  
 signeto suo obsignatas nobis inscriptas et datas nuper cum  
 honore et reverencia debitis recepimus tenorem subsequentem  
 complectentes [fol. 56]:

BY THE KYNGE. RYGHTE reverende father in Godde,  
 right trustie and welbeloved, we greete youe well. And  
 whereas the boke entitled the boke of comenue prayers and  
 administration of the sacramentes and other rightes and  
 ceremonies of the Churche after the use of the churche of  
 Englande<sup>1</sup> was agreed upon and setforthe by acte of parliament,  
 and by the same acte commaunded to be used<sup>2</sup> of all personnes  
 wythin this oure realme, yet nevertheless we are informed that  
 dyvers unquiete and evill disposed persons sithence the apprehension  
 of the duke of Sommersett have noysed and bruted abrode that  
 they shode have agayne theire olde lattenne service, their  
 coniuured bredde and water wythe soche lyke vayne and superstuouse  
 ceremonies, as thoghe the settinge forthe of the saide boke had  
 bene thonellie acte of the saide duke. We therefore, by thadvice  
 of the bodie and state of oure privey counsaile, not onelie  
 consideringe the saide boke to be oure acte and thacte of thole  
 state of oure realme assembled together in parliament, but also  
 the same to be grounded upon Holie Scripture, agreable to  
 thordre of the primative churche and moche to the reedifiinge of  
 oure subiectes, to put away all soche vayne expectation of  
 having the publike service, thadministration of the sacramentes  
 and other rightes and ceremonies agayne in the lattenne tonge

(whiche were but a preferment of ignoraunce to knowledge and darknesse to light and a preparation to bringe in papistrie and superstition agayne) have thought goode by thadvice aforesaide to requier and neverthelesse straightlie to commaunde and charge youe that immediatelie upon the receipte hereof you<sup>3</sup> do commaunde the deane and prebendaries of youre cathedrall churge, the parsonne, vicar or curate and churchwardens of everie perishe wythin youre diocesse to bringe and delyver unto youe or youre deputie (any of theme from<sup>4</sup> there churche and peryshe) at soche convenient place as youe shall appoynte all antiphoners,<sup>5</sup> missalles, grayles, processionalles, manuelles, legendes, pies, portasies, jornalles and<sup>6</sup> ordinalles after the use of Sarum, Lincoln,<sup>7</sup> Yorke or anie other private use and all other bokes of service, the kepinge wherof sholde be a lette to the usy[n]ge of the saide boke of comenue prayers, and that youe take the same bokes into youre handes, or into the handes of youre deputie, and them so deface and abolyse that they never after may serve eyther to anie soche use as they were provided for or be at any tyme a lette to that godly and uniforme ordre whiche by a commonne consent is nowe set forthe. And if youe shall fynde anie personne stoborne or disobedient in not bringinge in the saide bokes accordinge to the tenor of these oure lettres, that thenne ye committe the saide personne to warde unto soche tyme as youe have certified us of his misbehavior. And we will and commaund youe that youe also serche or cause serche to be made frome tyme to tyme whither anie boke be wythdrawne or hidde contrarie to the tenor of these oure

letters, and the same boke to receyve into youre handes and to use as in these oure lettres we have appointed. And furthermore, where as it is comenue to oure knowledge that dyvers frowarde and obstinate persons do refuse to pay towards the fyndinge of bredde and wyne for the Holie Communion accordinge to thordre prescribed in the saide boke, by reasonne whereof the Hollie Communion is manie tymes amitted upon the Sonday, these are to will and commaunde youe to convent soche obstinate personnes before youe and theme to admonyshe and<sup>8</sup> commaunde to kepe thordre prescribed in the saide boke. And if anie shall refuse so to do, to ponysh the same by suspencion, excommunication or other censures of the church. Fayle youe not thus to do as youe will avoyde oure displeasure.

YEVEN undre oure signet at oure palace of Westminster the xxv<sup>th</sup> of December, the thirde yeare of oure reigne. By the Kyng. To the moste reverende father in Godde our right trustie and welbeloved counsaylor tharchebusshop of Canterburie. In calce haec nomina habentur: Thomas Cantuariensis, R. Ryche cancellarius, William Seintjohn, J. Russell, H. Dorsett, W. Northampton. Inscriptio haec est:<sup>9</sup>

NOS VERO affectantes ex animo eiusdem domini nostri Regis litteris et mandatis obtemperare, volentesque pro nostre erga regiam celsitudinem officio in demandatis<sup>10</sup> negotiis omnem nostram curam et solertem adhibere diligentiam, vobis pro parte sue regie maiestatis districto precipiendo mandamus harum serie quatenus receptis presentibus cum omni qua poteritis celeritate et diligentia maturis dilectos filios nostros

decanum, canonicos et prebendarios ecclesie Christi Cantuariensis necnon rectores, vicarios, curatos, plebanos ac syndicos et iconicos quarumcumque ecclesiarum perochialium nostre diocesis Cantuariensis moneatis, hortetis et precipiendo mandetis quatenus ipsi et eorum quilibet [fol. 56v.] vel singuli omnes et singulos libros in eisdem literis regis specifico nominatos nobis aut nostro in hac parte commissione vel deputato infra palacium nostrum Cantuariensem infra novem dies, monitionem et intimationem vestras eis fiendas proxime sequentes, realiter afferant, adducant et penes nos vel nostrum deputatum huiusmodi<sup>11</sup> relinquant et deponant, ceteraque omnia et singula in dictis litteris descripta perimpleant, exequantur et sedulo fieri curent quatenus eos et eorum quemlibet contingunt vel concernunt. Sicque vos et vestrum alter sedulo exequantur, sincere perimpleant et diligenter obiat quae ad vestram in hac parte functionem pro congrua executione litterarum predictarum dinoscitur pertinere omnibus mora, dilatione, conventia et fuco penitus remotis, prout eidem domino nostro Regi sub vestro incumbente periculo obtemperare et respondere velitis et vult vestrum alter. Et quid in hac parte feceritis et exequi curaveritis id totum et omne nobis quam citissime significatum iri non postponetis.

DAT' IN MANERIO nostro de Lambithe decimo quarto die mensis Februarii anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo quadragésimo nono et regni dicti invictissimi in Christo principis et domini nostri Edwardi sexti quarto et nostre consecrationis decimo septimo.<sup>12</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>The authoritative text of the English liturgies of 1549 is to be found in P.S., Liturgies, pp. 1-158. <sup>2</sup>wyt follows used and is erased in MS. <sup>3</sup>you omitted in MS. <sup>4</sup>for in MS. <sup>5</sup>An antiphoner contained all parts of the offices which were sung antiphonally by the choir; missals comprised everything to be said or sung at, with ceremonial directions for, the mass; grails contained the antiphons to be sung by the choir after the epistle; a processional preserved the litanies, hymns and prayers for use in processions; manuals contained the forms prescribed to the parish priest for the administration of the sacraments; legends comprised the lessons to be read at the offices; a pie was the name given in England in the fifteenth century to the ordinals, which was the book which gave directions for the saying of the service and the variations in the ecclesiastical year; portus was the name used in England in the Middle Ages for the breviary, the book which contained the psalms, hymns, lessons and prayers to be recited at the offices; journals were service books which comprised the day hours of the daily offices; cf. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, 2nd ed. (London, 1974), sub verbo. For antiphoners and legends, see also F. Procter and W.H. Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer (London, 1925), pp. 15-16. <sup>6</sup>and written above the line in MS. <sup>7</sup>The MS. is stained by ink from the reverse face of the folio. <sup>8</sup>warne struck through in MS. <sup>9</sup>The inscriptio is omitted; cf. fol. 57. <sup>10</sup>in added as a correction; nobis following demandatis struck through in MS. <sup>11</sup>huiusmodi added as a correction. <sup>12</sup>Cf. 3 & 4 Edw. VI, c. 10; Stat. Realm. IV, i, pp. 110-11. On 25 Dec. 1549, a proclamation to the same effect was issued. Cf. Hughes and Larkin, Proclamations, I, pp. 485-6. The archbishop's mandate is printed in P.S., Cranmer II, pp. 522-4]

70[fols 56v.-7]

The like to M. John Butler, commissary general in the town



and marches of Calais(Calitie, Calisiae), under pain of the King's displeasure. He is to order all rectors[etc.; of 69] to surrender the aforementioned books to him or to his deputy at a suitable place within Calais within six days of intimation. He is to inform the archbishop[etc.; of. 69]. 14 Feb., 1550 (4 Edw. VI).<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>The liturgical uses in the letters missive are named as Sarum, Lincoln, York, Bangor, Hereford or any other]

71A[fols 57-v.]

Commission at pleasure to M. Griffin Leyson, LL.D., as official of the court of Canterbury. He is to rescribe in all appeals interposed before the court and to proceed in all cases, judging them 'extra offensum legum et statutorum dicti regni', and to do all else necessary. He is first to swear the oath 'de renunciando, recusando et refutando Romano pontifice eiusque auctoritate et iurisdictione usurpatis et secundum statuta parliamentorum huius incoliti regni Anglie'. Lambeth, 2 March 1550(4 Edw. VI).

71B[fols 57v.-8]

Commission at pleasure to the same as dean of the arches, provided that he first renounce the authority of the bishop of Rome[etc.; of. 71A]. He is to visit all churches and chapels, the clergy



and people of the deanery, to receive procurations and to punish detecta belonging 'ad...forum ecclesie de iure vel consuetudine aut legibus vel statutis huius...regni Anglie'. He is to proceed in all causes ad instanciam partium or ex officio. He is to prove all wills, save those of magnates possessing bona notabilia aut debita in several dioceses, to commit administration of their goods, and of the goods of those who die intestate, to those who may receive the same and to do all else necessary. Lambeth, 2 March 1550(4 Edw. VI).

## 71C

Commission at pleasure to the same as auditor of causes and official principal. He is to proceed in all causes ex officio and ad instanciam partium in the archbishop's audience court according to the laws and statutes of the realm and to do all else necessary. He is first to swear the oath[etc.; of 71A]. Lambeth, 2 March 1550(4 Edw. VI).<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>The marginal heading reads: 'Commissio Magistro Griffino Leyson auditoris audiencie Cant' et vicarii etc.']

## 71D[fol. 58-v.]

Commission to the same as dean of the arches[cf. 71B].<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>A marginal heading reads: 'Vacat quia registratur in precedenti pagina']

71E

Acta in the admission of M. Griffin Leyson (Layson) LL.D. to the above offices. On Thurs. 6 March 1550(4 Edw. VI) in a room in Lambeth palace, in the presence of Anthony Huse, principal registrar, the archbishop admitted Leyson as official of the court of Canterbury, dean of the arches and chancellor. Leyson swore in person to renounce the authority of the bishop of Rome[etc.; cf. 71A], to administer justice indifferently and to obey the statutes of the court of Canterbury and of the audience court, comprising canon law and parliamentary statute. The archbishop gave to him three commissions, each dated 2 March, and the seals of the audience and of the deanery of the arches. Leyson then swore to exercise jurisdiction as M. William Cooke LL.D., formerly official, dean and chancellor, had done. Present as witnesses were Richard Herde and Peter Allexander, gents, chamberlains of the archbishop.

72[fols 58v.-9]

Commission to Nicholas Dixon for life to be beadle and keeper of the registers in the court of Canterbury. Lambeth, 20 Jan. 1550.

73

Letters missive from the King and council[etc.; cf. 69 with the liturgical uses named as in 70 and W. Northe for W. Northampton]. Westminster, 25 Dec., 3 Edw. VI[1549].

74[fol. 59v.]

Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury reciting a royal writ, Teste meipso, dated at Westminster 4 March, 4 Edw. VI[1550] under the great seal, Marten. The archbishop is to publish, under pain of displeasure, in the cathedral, collegiate and parish churches, chapels and elsewhere within the diocese and jurisdiction certain decrees, drawn up with the advice of the council, according to the form of a certain statute[not registered in MS.] The archbishop orders the archdeacon to assemble before him as quickly as possible the dean, chapter and other ministers of the cathedral, all rectors, vicars, rural deans, curates and ministers and all laymen in the diocese, under pain of displeasure, and to recite the decrees and the royal writ. He is to inform the archbishop of his actions under his seal before 1 April. Lambeth, 7 March 1550(4 Edw. VI).

75[fols 59v.-60]

Signification to John Baker Kt, chancellor of the court of first fruits and tenths, at the petition of Richard Thomelynson (also Thomelyson), presbiter, rector of Great Horkeley (Horsley magna) in the diocese of London, that during the recent vacancy caused by the death of Ralph Daniell, Thomas Sayer, assiser, of High Holborn(High Holborne) by the suburbs of London, presented Richard Skeyes, presbiter, to the bishop of London for institution by reason of a grant of the advowson

from the prior and convent of Prittlewell(Prytelwod), now suppressed. Skeyes was not instituted and the archbishop collated Thomelynson iure devoluto to the rectory on 18 Feb. Lambeth, 10 May 1550(4 Edw. VI).

76

Commission to Griffin Leyson[etc.] to relax the suspension on Thomas Docwray, notary public, and to re-admit him as a proctor in the court of Canterbury. Lambeth, 19 April 1550 (4 Edw. VI).

77[fol. 60-v.]

Commission at pleasure to Robert Tayler LL.B. as dean of South Malling. Wishing to fulfil the demands of his pastoral office, laid upon him by the King, to root out vices and to sow virtue whenever possible in administering his diocese and peculiar jurisdictions, and perceiving that the deanery has all too long lacked an administrator, to the injury of the souls of the King's subjects, the archbishop appoints Tayler as dean. He is to visit all churches and chapels, the clergy and people and to receive procurations, to punish crimes according to the laws and statutes of the realm and to proceed in all cases ex officio or ad instanciam partium. He is to prove all wills, save those of magnates having bona notabilia vel debita in several dioceses or peculiar

jurisdictions of the province, to commit the administration of their goods, and of the goods of those who die intestate, to lawful executors and to do all else necessary. He is first to swear to renounce the authority of the bishop of Rome according to statute and to take Anthony Huse[etc.] or a deputy as scribe of the acts and registrar of the deanery, who will record the acts in the archiepiscopal register. Lambeth, 10 May 1550(4 Edw. VI).

78[fol. 61]

[9 May, 1551. Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury, reciting letters missive from the King and privy council. The archdeacon is to ensure that the act of parliament against unlawful assemblies is recited in all churches as directed]

THOMAS etc. per illustrissimum et inviotissimum in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum Edwardum sextum etc. ad infrascripta rite suffultus dilecto in Christo filio archidiacono Cantuariensi seu eius officiali salutem, graciosam et benedictionem. Litteras missivas dicti metuendissimi domini nostri Regis manu sua regia signatas, eiusque signeto obsignatas, nominibus illustrissimorum virorum dominorum a secretis consiliis suis regis in calce earundem subscriptas,<sup>1</sup> nobis inscriptas et directas nuper cum debiti officii nostri obsequio accepimus, tenorem subsequentem complectentes:

MOSTE REVERENDE father in God, right trustie and

right welbeloved counsaylor we grete youe well. And where as it is comme to oure knowledge that there be dyverse leude and seditious persons in certayne partes of oure realme that practise and devyse the meanes to stirre up unlaufull assembles and communications<sup>2</sup> to the troble and unquiete of us and oure lovinge subiectes, forsomoch as we intende to mete wythe the saide practizees in tyme, we have thought goode amonge other thinges that we have sett forth for the purpose taddresse unto youe(as we have done the lyke to all other prelates of oure realme) these bokes of an acte of parliament made and establyshed in the thirde yeare of oure reigne<sup>3</sup> for the conteyninge of oure subiectes in quiet and goode ordre and the suppression of the rebellion, if at any tyme any sholde happenne to be practised or begonne wythin oure realme. Wherefore we require and straightly charge and commaunde youe to geve substantiall ordre thorough oute all youre diocese that wythin every parishe churchye wythin the same the saide acte may be openly and distinctely redde by the parson or curate to the perochians every Sonday or every seconde Sonday at the leaste at soche tyme in the morninge as thassemblye of the saide perochians is moste frequent, to thend they may be frome tyme to tyme admonyshed of there duties and of the perell that shall ensue to them that shall devise or attempt any thinge contrary to the saide acte. And like as we in this perilous tyme have thought it necessary for the preservation of the comen quiete of oure realme taddresse to youe and the rest of oure prelates theis oure letters wythe oure saide acte, so oure speciall trust is

that youe for youre parte will see the same effectually done  
and executed thoroughoute youre diocese, so duellie and wythe  
soohe regarde and care as thimportance of the case requirethe.  
Whereof fayle youe not as youe tendre oure pleasure and will  
avoyde oure indignation.

Yeven undre oure signet at oure mannor of Grenewyche  
the sixte of May in the fifte yeare of oure reigne. In calce hec  
nomina habentur: E. Sommersett, R. Ryohe, cancellarius,  
W. Wilteshire, J. Warryoke, J. Bedforthe, E. Clinton. Inscriptio  
talis est: To the moste reverende father in God oure right  
trustie and right welbeloved counsaylor tharoheshopp of  
Canterburie.

NOS vero affectantes ex animo eiusdem domini nostri  
Regis litteris et mandatis obtemperare, volentesque pro  
nostro erga suam regiam celsitudinem officio in demandatis  
nobis negotiis omnem nostram curam et solertem adhibere  
diligentiam, vobis pro parte sue regie maiestatis districte  
precipiendo mandamus harum serie quatenus receptis presentibus  
cum omni qua poteritis celeritate et diligentia maturis  
dilectos filios nostros rectores, vicarios et curatos  
quarumcumque ecclesiarum parochialium nostre diocesis Cantuar'  
moneatis et precipiendo mandetis quatenus ipsi et eorum  
quilibet vel singuli actum sive statutum parliamenti in eisdem  
litteris regis specificatum, cuius unum exemplar tipi<sup>4</sup>  
excusum vobis unacum<sup>5</sup> presentibus per latorem presentis nostri  
mandati transmittimus, singulis diebus dominicis vel saltem  
qualibet secunda die dominica in ecclesia sua parochiali coram



perochianis eiusdem mane, quum et quando perochiani cuiuslibet  
perochie ad divina audienda in ecclesia sua frequentes  
adfuerint, publice distincta, aperta ac alta et intelligibili  
voce perlegant ac cetera omnia et singula in dictis litteris  
regis descripta perimpleant, exequantur et sedulo fieri  
curent, omnibus mora, dilatione et fuce penitus remotis,  
prout eidem domino nostro Regi sub vestro incumbente periculo  
obtemperare et respondere velitis et vult vestrum alter.  
Et quid in premissis feceritis et exequi curaveritis id totum  
et omne nobis quam citissime significatum iri non postponatis.

DAT' IN manerio nostro de Lambeth nono die mensis  
Maii anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo quinquagesimo primo  
regniue eiusdem<sup>6</sup> felicissimi domini nostri Regis anno quinto,  
et nostre consecrationis decimo nono.<sup>7</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>eorundem subscriptis in MS.      <sup>2</sup>communications struck through  
in part in MS.      <sup>3</sup> & 4 Edw. VI, c. 5; cf. Stat. Realm. IV,  
i, pp. 104-8.      <sup>4</sup>tipis in MS.      <sup>5</sup>una suprascript in MS.  
<sup>6</sup>eiusdem interlined as a correction in MS.      <sup>7</sup>Printed in  
P.S., Cranner II, pp. 530-1.]

79[fols 61-2]

Commission to Robert Tayler(Taylor) LL.B. as dean of South  
Malling[cf. 77].<sup>1</sup> Lambeth, 10 May 1550(4 Edw. VI).

[<sup>1</sup>A marginal heading reads 'Vacat quia registratur in precedenti  
pagina']



80

Commission to M. Griffin Leyson LL.D., official of the court of Canterbury and dean of the arches, to admit Thomas Willet (also Wyllet) notary public, a member of the archbishop's household, as a proctor in the court of Canterbury. Lambeth, 6 Oct. 1551.

81

Commission to the same to admit George Harryson (also Harison) notary public, as a proctor of the court of Canterbury, despite the fact that he has not practised for one year and that the number of proctors is full. Croydon, 23 Aug. 1551.

82A[fol. 62v.-3]

Commission to Christopher Nevinson LL.D. as commissary general in the diocese of Canterbury. He is to proceed in all causes ex officio or ad instanciam partium according to the statutes of the realm. He may sequester the tithes and goods of all the King's subjects; induct men into benefices; grant licences to parties who wish to marry, so that the banns may be called once or twice, even if this should occur in times prohibited; and remove from office all those holding benefices or ecclesiastical preferment unlawfully. He is enjoined to punish all those found guilty of heresy, blasphemy, adultery, incest, drunkenness and gluttony. He may purge clerks convicted

before secular magistrates, who claim benefit of clergy;  
 prove the wills of those who die within the diocese and of  
 all those who possess bona, iura sive credita in more than  
 one diocese, provided that the diocese of Canterbury be  
 one in which the goods are held and that it be the place of  
 death; commit administration of their goods and of the goods  
 of those who die intestate to executors; visit the churches,  
 clergy and people of the diocese; appoint rural deans, apparitors  
 and confidential messengers; and do all else necessary, with  
 power to collect fees. The commission is granted for life,  
 to run during the pontificate of the archbishop and of his  
 successors. Lambeth, 17 March 1548(2 Edw. VI).

# 82B

Ratification of the same under their common seal by the dean  
 and chapter of Christ Church Canterbury. Chapter house,  
 24 April 1548.

# 83[fols 63-v.]

Commission to M. Griffin Leyson LL.D.[etc.; of. 80] to admit  
 Edward Briggess(also Bigges, Bygges), notary public and student  
 of the court, as a proctor in the court of Canterbury, although  
 the number is already full[Undated].

84

Letters testimonial to John Baker Kt, chancellor of the court of first fruits and tenths, at the petition of Edmund Stubbes, presbiter. On 10 Oct., the archbishop collated Stubbes as rector of the parish church of East Horsley(Easthorsley, Easthorsey), in the deanery of Croydon; the institution was recorded in the archbishop's register. Stubbes did not gain possession of the church, for on the same day Ralph Hatley presbiter was admitted as rector and gained possession of the benefice which he now enjoys. Lambeth, 28 Nov. 1551(5 Edw. VI).

85[fols 63v.-4]

Letters testimonial to the same at the petition of Robert Medicke and William Bourne. Having searched his principal register as ordered, the archbishop has found that on 16 April 1547 Humphrey Cotten, presbiter, was admitted and instituted as rector of the parish church of Warden-in-Isle-of-Sheppey(Warden, Warden infra insulam de Schapeia) at the presentation of Thomas Chayney, Kt of the Garter.<sup>1</sup> On 25 March 1550, Cotten died at Waltham Cross(Waltham Sancte Crucis) in the parish of Cheshunt(Cesthunte, Cesthunt) in the diocese of London. His body was buried on the same day in the cemetery of Cheshunt parish church. 23 Oct. 1551(5 Edw. VI).

[<sup>1</sup>For Cotten's institution, cf. C.R., fol. 403]

86[fols 64-v.]

Commission at pleasure to M. Thomas Smythe(also Smyth) LL.B., archbishop's chaplain, as commissary general in the city and diocese of Canterbury. He is to proceed in all cases in the consistory court; to prove the wills of all those who die, not having bona. iura sive credita notabilia in several dioceses or peculiar jurisdictions of the province and to commit the administration of their goods and of the goods of those who die intestate to lawful executors; to induct into benefices all clerks admitted and instituted by the archbishop where induction belongs to the commissary general; to receive clerici convicti from secular magistrates; and to do all else necessary with power to receive fees. He is first to swear an oath according to statute denying the authority of the bishop of Rome. He is to govern according to canon law, custom, statute and royal commands. Croydon, 23 Aug. 1551(5 Edw. VI).

87A[fols 64v.-5]

Request from the same to the archbishop for the capture by the crown of Daniel Cranmer, excommunicant, of the parish of Bilsington. William Denne, of the parish of Kingston (Kingeston), promoted an office case against Cranmer concerning the inventory and accounts of administration of the goods of Thomas Bocher(also Bowcher), late of the parish of West Hythe (Hithe). As administrator of the deceased's goods, Cranmer was summoned before Smythe, but failed to appear. At the petition

of Denne, he incurred greater excommunication. The decree was published more than forty days ago and Cranmer remains obdurate. Sealed with 'sigillum regie maiestatis ad causas ecclesiasticas infra commissariatum Cantur'.<sup>1</sup> Canterbury, 16 Jan. 1553(6 Edw. VI); Thomas Smythe, commissary of Canterbury.

[<sup>1</sup>By a statute of 1547, all ecclesiastical summonses and citations were henceforth to run in the King's name. The bishop's name was to stand as Teste. Seals of spiritual courts were to bear the King's arms. Cf. Stat. Realm, IV, 1, pp. 3-4.]

#### 87B

Signification of the same to the crown. The archbishop requests that according to statute and long custom, the King instruct his officers to capture Cranmer. Lambeth, 31 Jan. 1553(7 Edw. VI).

#### 88A[fol. 65v.]

Mandate in the name of Edward VI to the official of the court of Canterbury and dean of the arches. In recent royal letters, sealed with the signet, the archbishop was instructed to publish certain articles concerning the Christian faith to abolish diversity of religious belief among the clergy and people of his jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> They are to summon all rectors, vicars, priests, stipendiaries, curates, rural deans, ministers, schoolmasters, preachers, all those possessing ecclesiastical

office and churchwardens from each parish in the deanery to assemble in person before the archbishop in the hall of Lambeth palace on Fri., 23 June between 7 am and 9 am to receive further instruction. The official and dean are to certify to the execution of the mandate on the day of assembly, with a list of those cited. Teste Thomas Cant'.. 19 June 7 Edw. VI[1553].<sup>2</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>I.e. the forty-two Articles. Cf. P.S., Liturgies, pp. 526-37. <sup>2</sup>Printed in Wilkins, Concilia, IV, p. 79]

88B[fols 65v.-6]

Certificate of execution addressed to the archbishop from John Gymbon, Cl.L.P., commissary of the deanery of the arches. All those named in the royal mandate were cited to appear before the archbishop[etc.] by Richard Clony, litteratus, apparitor, in each parish on 21 and 22 June. Absent were: M. John Josephe, rector of St Mary le Bow(Beate Marie de Archubus); M. Richard Marshe, rector of St Pancras(Sanoti Pancrasii); M. Peter Alexander, rector of All Hallows, Lombard Street(Omnium Sanctorum in Lombartstrete); M. John Graye, rector of St John the Evangelist, Watling Street(Sanoti Johannis Evangeliste in Watlyngstrete); M. John Palysgrave, rector of St Dunstan in the East(Sanoti Dunstani in Orienti). Sealed with 'sigillum regie maiestatis ad causas ecclesiasticas', belonging to the archdeacon of Surrey, by the archdeacon's official. 22 June, 1553.

[The remainder of fol. 66 is blank]

Diverse Littere recorded elsewhere in

Thomas Cranmer's Register

89[fol. 344v.]

Commission at pleasure to M. Peter Ligham, Dec.D., and  
M. Robert Colyns, LL.B., as commissaries general in the  
city and diocese of Canterbury. They are to proceed in all  
causes in consistory; to prove wills and commit the  
administration of the goods of those who die intestate to  
executors; and to do all else necessary. They are to act  
according to canon law and custom. Lambeth(Lamehith).  
17 March 1534.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>The archiepiscopal style runs: 'THOMAS permissione divina Cant'  
archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et apostolice sedis  
legatus'.]

90[fol. 361-v.]

Commission at pleasure to M. George Wynnsley, Cn & Cl.L.B.,  
as dean of Shoreham. He is to proceed in all causes within  
the deanery; to prove all wills and commit the administration  
of the goods of those who die intestate to executors; to induct  
into benefices all those instituted by the archbishop; to  
visit all churches, chapels, the clergy and people; to  
collect procurations and to receive all emoluments due to  
the archbishop and his cathedral church; and to do all else  
necessary. He is to take William Potkyn, the archbishop's  
principal registrar and registrar of the deanery for life, or  
a deputy, as scribe 'reservatis nobis et dicto registro nostro  
omnibus et singulis registris, munimentis et actis per te tempore



exercitii officii tui auctoritate nostra exerceitis et exercendis  
et nobis per te seu deputatum dicti registrarii nostri  
principalis singulis annis exhibendis'. Wynnsley is to act  
 according to the statutes of the realm, canon law and the  
 customs of the deanery. Lambeth, 10 April 1537.

21A[fol. 215-v.]

Mandate to the archdeacon of Canterbury ordering the publication  
 of royal injunctions and an accompanying letter, transmitted  
 by Thomas Crumwell, Kt of the Garter, lord Crumwell, keeper  
 of the privy seal, vicar general and official principal. The  
 archdeacon is to assemble before him the clergy and people of the  
 diocese as quickly as possible and to recite the injunctions  
 and letter. Lambeth, 11 Oct. 1538.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Printed in Wilkins, Concilia, III, p. 837]

21B

Note that similar mandates were sent to M. John Butlar,  
 commissary in the town and marches of Calais, to the dean of  
 South Malling and to the dean of Booking.

22A

Letter in English from Thomas Crumwell, asserting that the

King disapproves of the clergy's negligence in the diocese of Canterbury towards his former injunctions and of their superstition and idolatry. Since his office demands that untrue religion and abuses be abolished, the King orders the archbishop to assemble before him all the clergy of the diocese and to distribute a further set of injunctions, copies of which he is to obtain. He is to enjoin obedience under pain of incurring the penalties expressed in them.

London, 30 Sept. Thomas Cromwell.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>The marginal heading reads: 'Littere private domini Thome Cromwell regi vicemgerentis'; printed in R.B. Merriman, Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell, 2 vols(Oxford, 1902), II, pp. 156-7]

## 92B

Royal injunctions in English, issued to[blank] on the authority of the crown by Thomas Cromwell, lord privy seal and vicegerent.

1. The previous set of injunctions is to be observed, under pain of incurring deprivation, sequestration of the fruits of ecclesiastical preferment or further punishment from the King or vicegerent.

2. Before Easter, a whole Bible in English is to be set up in each church in a place where parishoners may read it. Half the cost of the book is to be met by the parson and half by the parishoners.

3. Every Christian man who wishes to be saved is to be encouraged to read the Bible, which is the very lively Word of God, and to discover its true sense. Disputes are to be

avoided and obscure passages referred to divines.

4. Every Sunday and holy day, parishoners are to learn a part of the Pater Noster, the Creed or the Ten Commandments in English until they know them by rote. The sense of each sentence is to be expounded. Parents and householders are to teach them to their children and servants.

5. [fol. 215v.-16] At Lent, those who come to confession are to be examined in their knowledge of the articles of faith and the Pater Noster in English. If they fail such examination, they are to learn them during the coming year. Without such knowledge, they ought not to receive the sacrament of the altar. If they do, they cause dissension and imperil their souls.

Such a practice is to be forbidden by further royal injunctions.

6. During every quarter of the year, one sermon at least is to declare the gospel of Christ and exhort the hearers to works of charity, mercy and faith which are commended by Scripture. Pilgrimages, offerings of money, candles or tapers to images or relics, which are kissed and licked, and rosaries are works of idolatry and superstition not commanded by Scripture, which incur punishment from God.

7. Images which are abused in this way are to be removed. The only lights to be allowed before images are the light which goes across the church by the rood loft, the light before the sacrament of the altar and the light at the sepulchre. Parishoners are to be admonished that images are books for men who cannot read. If they abuse images for any reason other than for a remembrance, they commit idolatry. The King is to further labour to abolish such images.

8. In every benefice where an incumbent is not resident, curates are to be appointed who will duly fulfil their duties and publish the injunctions. The incumbent is to act as an example of true morality and to teach the Word of God.

9. No man is to preach in any benefice unless he be licensed by the King, the archbishop of Canterbury or by his diocesan bishop.

10. If any cleric has commended to his parishoners any superstition, he is to recant and show that it is a common error and abuse.

11. Any cleric who discovers a man who hinders the preaching of the Word of God in English, the publication of the injunctions or who supports the power of the bishop of Rome, now extirpated by statute, is to detect him to the King, council, vicegerent or a justice of the peace.

12. Every parish church is to be provided with a register, in which is to be recorded every Sunday by the parson, vicar or curate in the presence of at least one church warden the date and the names of all those christened, married or buried in the parish during the previous week. The register is to be kept in a chest with two locks, provided from common funds; one key is to be kept by the priest, the second by the church wardens. A fine of 3s 4d is to be levied each time registration is omitted, the money being devoted to the repair of the church.

13[fol. 216v.] Both sets of royal injunctions are to be recited to the parishoners once every quarter.

14. All men are bound by law to pay tithes. Parsons and curates

who neglect their duty are to be reported to their ordinaries.

15. No parson is to alter the form of any fast or service commended by the church unless it is specified in the royal injunctions or is done by royal authority. The eves of saints' days and the commemoration of Thomas Bekket are now abrogated and to be observed as ferial days.

16. The knelling of Aves, which was introduced by authority of the bishop of Rome to gain pardons, is to be omitted.

17. In processions, men have sung Ora pro nobis to so many saints that they have been forced to omit Parce nobis Domine and Libera nos Domine. The petition Ora pro nobis must be omitted and replaced by the remaining suffrages.<sup>1</sup>

[<sup>1</sup>Printed in Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 275-81]

## 93

Commission to M. Richard Lyell LL.D. as dean of Shoreham, Croydon, Bocking, Tarring(Tarryng), Pagham and Risborough (Risbergh). He is to proceed in all causes; to prove wills and to commit the administration of the goods of those who die intestate to executors; to induct into benefices those instituted by the archbishop; to visit churches and chapels, the clergy and people of the deaneries and to correct the detecta and comperta; and to do all else necessary. All previous commissions are to be of no effect. He is to receive all fees and to take Anthony Huse, the archbishop's principal

registrar and registrar of the deaneries for life, as scribe of the acts.<sup>1</sup> Lambeth, 14 Oct. 1538.

[<sup>1</sup>A scribe has added the words: 'per te seu deputatum dicti registrarum nostri principalis singulis annis exhibendis'. Wynnsley's commission as dean of Shoreham in April 1537 shows that the clause requiring the acta to be returned to the registry at Lambeth has been imperfectly recorded in Lyell's commission. Cf. C.R., fols 361-v.]

94[fol. 217]

Commission for life to M. Nicholas Wutton LL.D. as commissary of the faculties. Parliamentary statute<sup>1</sup> allows the archbishop to issue dispensations to the King's subjects in cases in which the bishop of Rome could dispense and in all other cases not prohibited by divine law. Wutton is to grant such dispensations, in person or by deputies, according to the terms of the statute, to receive all fees and to take possession of the seal ad facultates. Lambeth(Lambhithe), 16 Oct. 1538.

[<sup>1</sup>Cf. Stat. Realm, III, pp. 464-71; the remainder of fol. 217 is blank]

VISITATIO NORWICENSIS: Thomas Cranmer's

Register fols 137v.-40

[fol. 137v.]

[28 July - 19 October 1534. Acta in the archbishop's  
metropolitical visitation of the diocese of Norwich]

ACTA VISITATIONIS REVERENDISSIMI IN Christo patris et domini  
domini Thome permissione divina Cantuariensis archiepiscopi,  
totius Anglie primatis et metropolitani iure metropolitico  
facta reverendum in Christo patrem et dominum dominum Richardum  
permissione divina Norwicensem episcopum concernentia et per  
venerabilem virum Magistrum Willelmum Maye legum doctorem  
dicti reverendissimi patris commissarium sufficienter et  
legitime deputatum exercita sequuntur:<sup>1</sup>

VICESIMO octavo die mensis Julii anno Domini millesimo  
quingentesimo tricesimo quarto in loco capitulari ecclesie  
cathedralis Norwicensis, dictus venerabilis vir Magister  
Willelmus Maye commissarius antedictus tunc et ibidem sedens  
negotium visitationis dictum reverendum patrem Norwicensem  
episcopum concernentem, ad subeundem visitationem metropoliticoam  
dicti reverendissimi patris Cant' archiepiscopi prefatis die  
et loco legitime et peremptorie alias monitum, executurus (de qua  
quidem monitione per Rogerum Baynes litteratum mandatarium  
et nuncium specialem ad hec deputatum eidem commissario prius  
certificatum fuerit)<sup>2</sup> et primo tunc et ibidem litteras suas  
commissionales a dicto reverendissimo patre Cant' archiepiscopo  
sibi directas per me Edmundum Clifton notarium publicum in  
presencia prioris et conventus diote ecclesie cathedralis  
publice legi fecit. Quibus sic perlectis, idem Magister Willelmus



Maye onus earundem litterarum commissionarium in se assumpsit et decrevit procedendum iuxta vim, formam et effectum earundem ac me Edmundum Clifton in actorum suorum scribam ad diote visitationis negotium tunc et ibidem assumpsit. Et statim dictus commissarius prefatum reverendum patrem Norwicensem episcopum, alias ad comparandum dictis die et loco negotium visitationis predictae in forma iuris subiturum legitime et peremptorie monitum, publice per quendam Robertum Elingworth litteratum ter in capitulo, deinde ad hostium eiusdem preconizari fecit. Quem sic ut prefertur preconizatum, monitum, diuque expectatum et nullo modo comparentem pronunciaverit contumacem ac pene<sup>3</sup> contumacie sue huiusmodi mod[e]rationem et declarationem eiusdem sibi pro loco et tempore congruis et oportunis reservaverit. Postea vero emanavit decretum sive citatio sub hoc tenore verborum:

THOMAS permissione divina Cant' archiepiscopus, totius Anglie primas et metropolitanus universis et singulis rectoribus, vicariis, capellanis, curatis et non curatis clericis et litteratis quibuscumque per provinciam nostram Cantuar' ubilibet constitutis salutem, gratiam et benedictionem. Cum dilectus nobis in Christo Magister Willelmus Maye legum doctor noster in hac parte commissarius sufficienter et legitime deputatus rite et legitime procedens reverendum confratrem nostrum dominum Richardum eadem permissione Norwicensem episcopum, ad comparandum coram eo certis die et loco competentibus iam effluxis visitationem nostram metropoliticaam tunc ibidem per nos seu nostros in hac parte commissarios canonice exercendam et celebrandam subiturum ceteraque facturum et recepturum quod iuxta morem

huiusmodi visitationis nostre metropolitice fieri et recepi iusticia suadebit alias auctoritate nostra legitime et peremptorie<sup>4</sup> monitum et citatum et nullo modo comparentem, sed monitioni nostre huiusmodi parere et obedire contemptabiliter renuncientem et recusantem, pronunciaverit contumacem et penam huiusmodi sue contumacie reservaverit,<sup>5</sup> nos igitur Thomas archiepiscopus, primas et metropolitanus antedictus nolentes eundem reverendum confratrem nostrum in sua obstinacia et contumacia huiusmodi in aliorum perniciosum exemplum diutius perseverare sed ipsum ecclesiastica cohercione ad cor reducere, Deo coadiutore, summopere affectantes vobis coniunctim et divisim committimus ac firmiter iniungendo mandamus quatenus<sup>6</sup> debitis modestia et reverencia citetis seu citari faciatis peremptorie prefatum reverendum confratrem nostrum dominum Richardum Norwicensem episcopum (quem nos etiam tenore presentium sic citamus) quod compareat coram nobis aut nostro in hac parte commissario quocumque in ecclesia cathedrali Sancte Trinitatis Norwicensis<sup>7</sup> loco consistoriali ibidem vicesimo quinto die mensis Septembris proximo iam futuro inter horas primam et secundam post meridiem illius diei, cum continuatione et prorogatione dierum et horarum extunc sequentium ac locorum si oporteat fiendis et habendis, causam rationabilem et legitimam, si quam pro se habeat aut dicere sciat quare nos seu commissarius noster in ea parte contra eundem reverendum confratrem nostrum episcopum antedictum ad declarationem et moderationem pene contumacie huiusmodi procedere et, reverencia condigna pontificali suo dignitati semper salva, eandem contumaciam iuxta iuris exigentiam punire non debeamus seu debeat in debita iuris forma,

dicturus, ostensurus, allegaturus et propositurus ulteriusque  
facturus et recepturus quod iusticia in hac parte suadebit  
quodque natura et qualitas negotii huiusmodi de se exigunt et  
requirunt. Intimetis insuper eidem reverendo confratri nostro  
sic citato quod si et casu quo ipse dictis die, horis et loco  
debite comparuerit<sup>8</sup> sive non, nos aut idem commissarius noster  
contra eundem ad declarationem, moderationem et executionem  
pene huiusmodi iuxta iuris exigentiam tunc ibidem procedamus<sup>9</sup>  
seu procedat, ipsius sic citati et non comparentis absencia  
hinc verius contumacia<sup>10</sup> in aliquo non obstantibus. Et quid  
in premissis feceritis nos aut commissarium nostrum huiusmodi  
dictis die, hora et loco<sup>11</sup> vel citra debite certificet ille  
vestrum qui presens nostrum mandatum fuerit executus personaliter  
vel per litteras suas patentes unacum presentibus auctentice  
sigillatas. Dat' in manerio nostro de Lamhith quarto die  
mensis Augusti anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo  
quarto et<sup>12</sup> nostre consecrationis anno secundo.

Adveniente decimo nono die mensis Septembris anno  
Domini predicto in ecclesia parochiali de Walsingham parva coram  
dicto venerabili commissario, in presencia mei Edmundi Clifton  
scribe sue, tunc et ibidem iudicialiter sedenti comparuit  
personaliter quidam Rolandus Bacchus notarius publicus ad  
suprascripta mandatarius et certificavit se cum ea qua decuit  
reverencia dictum reverendum patrem Norwicensem episcopum  
xviii<sup>o</sup> die mensis Augusti predicti per eundem Rolandum in  
manerio eiusdem episcopi apud Hoxon personaliter apprehensum  
virtute et auctoritate dicti decreti sive citationis legitime  
et peremptorie citasse quod compareret coram dicto reverendissimo

patre Cant' archiepiscopo et metropolitano aut suo in hac parte commissario die et loco in dicto mandato sive decreto specificatis, facturus et recepturus quod tenor et effectus huiusmodi mandati in et de se exigunt et requirunt, intimando eidem reverendo patri prout in eodem continetur mandato. Super quibus omnibus et singulis dictus Rolandus Baeohus taotis per eum sacrosanctis Dei evangelis iura et fidem fecit tunc et ibidem.

Dicto vicesimo quinto die mensis Septembris adveniente anno Domini quo supra circiter horas primam vel secundam post meridiem eiusdem diei ad<sup>13</sup> hostium loci consistorialis ecclesie cathedralis Norwicensis coram dicto Magistro Willelmo Maye legum doctore commissario antedicto iudicialiter sedenti, ex eo quod hostium ipsius loci consistorialis erat ad tunc clausum in termino assignato dicto reverendo patri Norwicensi episcopo ad dicendum causam rationabilem et legitimam, si quam dictus reverendus pater Norwicensis episcopus pro se habuerit quare dictus commissarius contra eundem reverendum patrem episcopum Norwicensem ad declarationem et moderationem pene contumacie sue huiusmodi procedere non deberet, comparuit personaliter Magister Thomas<sup>14</sup> Cappe decretorum doctor protestans palam, publice et expresse quod per suam comparationem<sup>15</sup> nec per aliqua per eum dicta seu dicenda, allegata seu alleganda, non intendebat, ut asseruit, neque dictus reverendus pater dominus suus intendit in prefatum venerabilem virum dominum commissarium tanquam iudicem eidem domino suo in hac parte competentem quovismodo<sup>16</sup> consentire aut iurisdictionem dicti commissarii prorogare, animo ut asseruit

declinandi ipsius commissarii iurisdictionem. At quadam parte  
 seu portione cedule infrascripte per eundem Magistrum Thomam<sup>17</sup>  
 Cappe lecta premissam [fol. 138v.] protestationem concernentis,  
 idem Magister Thomas Cappe procuratorium suum pro dicto reverendo  
 patre Norwicensi episcopo realiter exhibuit, quod quidem  
 procuratorium penes acta realiter dimisit. Tenor vero  
 procuratorii huiusmodi sequitur et est talis:

PATEAT universis per presentes quod ego Richardus  
 Dei gracia Norwicensis episcopus dilectos mihi in Christo  
 Magistros Thomam Cappe decretorum doctorem, Willelmum White in  
 decretis bacchalaureum, Richardum Stone, Willelmum Neve et  
 Johannem Atkins notarios publicos coniunctim et eorum quemlibet  
 per se divisim meos veros et legitimos procuratores, actores,  
 factores, negotiorumque meorum gestores ac nuncios speciales  
 ordino, facio et constituo per presentes. Doque et concedo  
 eisdem procuratoribus meis coniunctim ut prefertur et divisim  
 potestatem generalem et mandatum speciale pro me et nomine meo  
 coram reverendissimo in Christo patre et domino domino Thoma  
 miseratione divina Cant' archiepiscopo, totius Anglie primate  
 et metropolitano vel alio iudice competenti<sup>18</sup> quocumque comparendi,  
 absenciamque personalem excusandi ac causam et causas absencie  
 huiusmodi allegandi, proponendi et, si opus fuerit,<sup>19</sup> probandi  
 necnon exceptiones et materias quascumque in hac parte mihi de  
 iure competenti proponendi et exhibendi easque admitti petendi  
 et obtinendi ac in quibuscumque causis et negotiis me prefatum  
 episcopum<sup>20</sup> vel personam meam seu dignitatem meam episcopalem  
 aut ecclesiam meam cathedralem Norwicensem qualitercumque  
 tangentibus motis seu movendis a quocumque gravamine continuato,

illato seu comminato provocandi et appellandi provocationesque et appellationes tam interpositas quam interponendas notificandi et intimandi et earum causas prosequendi, quodcumque insuper iuramentum licitum, honestum, canonicum et de iure requisitum in animam meam prestandi, subeundi et iurandi et generaliter omnia alia et singula faciendi, exercendi et expediendi que in premissis et circa ea necessaria fuerint seu quomodolibet oportuna, etiamsi mandatum de se magis exigant speciale quam presentibus est expressum, promittens me ratum, gratum et firmum perpetuo habiturum totum et quicquid per dictos<sup>21</sup> procuratores meos seu eorum aliquem actum, gestum, exercitum seu procuratum in premissis fuerit vel aliquo premissorum. In cuius rei testimonium sigillum meum presentibus apponi fecimus. Dat' in manerio nostro de Hoxne vicesimo die mensis Septembris anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo quarto et nostre consecrationis anno tricesimo quarto.

Post cuius quidem procuratorii exhibitionem reliquam partem prefate cedulae ad finem usque legebat ceteraque faciebat et exercebat prout in dicta papiri cedula quam in manibus suis tunc et ibidem tenuit et apud acta prefata dimisit plenius continetur. Cuius quidem cedula tenor sequitur:

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. Coram vobis venerabili viro Magistro Willelmo Maye legum doctore reverendissimi in Christo patris et domini domini Thome miseratione divina Cant' archiepiscopi, totius Anglie primatis et metropolitani in visitatione sua metropolitana infra civitatem et diocesim Norwicensis...,<sup>22</sup> Ego Thomas Cappe decretorum doctor, procurator et nomine reverendi in Christo patris et domini domini Richardi permissione

divina Norwicensis episcopi sufficenter et legitime constitutus, dico, allego et in hiis scriptis, animo declinandi vestram iurisdictionem pretensam quam in presenti declino et omnino difficeo,<sup>23</sup> propono ac palam et publice protestor in hiis scriptis quod per aliqua per me coram vobis nomine dicti reverendi domini mei dicta seu dicenda, proposita seu proponenda, exhibita et exhibenda, allegata seu alleganda, non intendo neque reverendus dominus meus intendit in vos tanquam iudicem eidem domino meo in hac parte competentem quovismodo consentire aut vestram iurisdictionem pretensam prorogare; qua protestatione michi et reverendo domino meo semper salva, quam in singulis per me nomine dicti reverendi domini mei agendis vel gerendis repeto et pro repetita habere volo. Dico et propono quod vos commissarius pretensus antedictus fuistis et estis iudex<sup>24</sup> omnino incompetens in hac parte, nullam penitus in dictum reverendum dominum meum habens iurisdictionem aut motionem saltem legitimam, et talis quod<sup>25</sup> coram quo non decet reverendum dominum meum comparere pro eo videlicet et ex eo quod persona vestra nulla dignitate fuit aut est fulcita aut aliter de iure qualificata, cuius pretextu dominus meus reverendus, tam ob reverenciam et honorem sacri pontificalis officii tam<sup>26</sup> propter alias iustas et rationabiles causas per partem domini mei reverendi vobis in hac parte expositas, non tenetur aliquo modo comparere vel respondere coram vobis maxime dicto reverendissimo patre Cant' archiepiscopo in sua provincia Cant' notorie esistenti; quodque tam de iure communi quam de consuetudine laudabili legitime<sup>27</sup> prescripta et observata non competit<sup>28</sup> alicui commissario cuiuscunque archiepiscopi [fol. 139] sentencias



suspensionis,<sup>29</sup> excommunicationis vel interdicti in personam alicuius episcopi vel<sup>30</sup> archiepiscopi existentem in sua provincia ferre, fulminare vel promulgare. Vos tamen maliciose et contra iuris dispositionem sepius et iteratis visibus publice iactitastis et comminati estis dictum reverendum dominum meum, in casu quo coram vobis minime comparuerit, suspendere vel excommunicare in ipsius domini mei reverendi ac status et dignitatis sue scandalum, preiudicium et gravamen. Que singula nomine quo supra propono coniunctim et divisim, animo vos et vestram in hac parte iurisdictionem recusandi. Quare cum nulla vobis in hac parte competit iurisdicatio, ego procurator predictus nomine procuratorio dicti reverendi domini mei instanter peto primo, secundo et tertio ipsum dominum meum et me eius nomine procuratorio ab ulteriori impetitione, molestatione, vexatione et perturbatione pretextu premissorum dimittendos et absolvendos fore, iuris beneficio eidem reverendo domino meo et michi eius nomine in omnibus semper salvo.

Super contentis in cedula huiusmodi habitis certis disputationibus tam per prefatum commissarium quam per legum doctores tunc ibidem presentes, dictus Magister Thomas Cappe procurator predictus nomine quo supra antequam dictus commissarius ad ulteriora processit alteram cedulam in scriptis conceptam sic incipientem: QUIA VOS commissarius pretensus antedictus allegationem, propositionem et petitionem meas iustas, rationabiles et legitimas nomine dicti reverendi patris domini mei coram vobis iudicialiter propositas admittere recusastis et reiecistis, ego Thomas Cappe procurator dicti reverendi patris



Norwicensis episcopi et eo quo supra nomine, sentiens dictum dominum meum et me eius nomine ex premissis indebite pregravare adherendo provocationi et appellationi prius per dictum reverendum patrem in hac parte legitime interpositis (quas quidem provocationem et appellationem quatenus expedit vobis intimo et notifico per presentes), ne idem reverendissimus in Christo pater Cantuariensis archiepiscopus aut vos eius commissarius pretensus antedictus quicquam in preiudicium dicti domini mei aut status vel dignitatis sue pontificalis de cetero attemptet vel attemptetis aut faciat vel faciatis aliquammodo attemptari, ad serenissimum in Christo principem et dominum nostrum dominum Henricum octavum Dei gracia Anglie et Francie Regem, fidei defensorem et Dominum Hibernie, totius ecclesie catholice Anglicane caput supremum in utraque huius regni convocatione concorditer recognitum pro dicto reverendo patre domino meo et suis adherentibus ac in futuris in premissis adherere<sup>31</sup> volentibus quibuscumque palam, publice et expresse in hiis scriptis a premissis gravaminibus appello et<sup>32</sup> apostolos peto primo, secundo et tertio instantanter, instantius et instantissime michi et eidem domino meo dari, tradi et liberari cum effectum, subjiiciens dictum dominum meum et me eius nomine statumque et dignitatem ipsius omnesque sibi in premissis adherentes seu in futurum adherere<sup>33</sup> volentes protectioni, tuitioni et defensionem dicti serenissimi Regis. Protestando et protestor nomine quo supra me velle hanc appellationem meam corrigere et emendare eidemque addere et ab eadem detrahere quotiens et cum mihi vel eidem

reverendo patri domino meo iuxta iurisperitorum consilium melius videbitur expedire, iuris beneficio in omnibus semper salvo; legebat, appellabat et apostolos petebat prout in eadem cedula continetur. Et immediate post tunc et ibidem dictus commissarius, ex eo quod cause in dicta prima cedula expresse et inserte fuerunt et sunt fide et<sup>34</sup> false...,<sup>35</sup> non probabiles nec verisimiles et quod appellatio predicta fuit interposita antequam aliquid erat attemptatum contra<sup>36</sup> dictum reverendum patrem Norwicensem episcopum et ex eo quod ille ipse reverendus pater Norwicensis episcopus verus contumax fuerit,<sup>37</sup> ex his causis aliisque multis (ut asseruit) eundem commissarium moventibus prefatum reverendum patrem, ad dictos diem et locum et ad horas predictas legitime et peremptorie alias citatum, preconizari fecit. Quem sic preconizatum diutiusque expectatum et non comparentem nec causam sufficientem dicentem, ostendentem, allegantem seu<sup>38</sup> proponentem, denuo pronunciaverit contumacem ac dictam contumaciam sic duxit puniendam, videlicet<sup>39</sup> dicto reverendo patri domino Richardo Norwicensi episcopo in penam contumacie sue huiusmodi ecclesie sue sacerdotale ministerium interdixit in scriptis sub hac tenore verborum:

IN DEI NOMINE AMEN. Nos Willelmus Maye legum doctor reverendissimi in Christo patris et domini domini Thome permissione divina Cantuariensis archiepiscopi, totius Anglie primatis et metropolitani in sua visitatione metropolitana per civitatem et diocesim Norwicensem commissarius sufficienter et legitime deputatus alias rite per lumen procedentes reverendum

in Christo patrem et dominum dominum Richardum permissione divina Norwicensem episcopum modernum, ad comparendum coram nobis certis die et loco competentibus iam effluxis, visitationem metropolitica[m] dicti reverendissimi patris Cant' archiepiscopi per nos auctoritate dicti reverendissimi patris exco[n]ducendam et celebrandam subiturum et recepturum quod iuxta morem huiusmodi visitationis fieri et recepti iusticia suadebit, alias auctoritate dicti reverendissimi patris Cant' archiepiscopi legitime et peremptorie monitum et citatum sepius preconizatum et nullo modo comparentem nec monitioni huiusmodi parentem pronunciamus contumacem, penam contumacie sue huiusmodi reservantes. Nosque commissarius antedictus ulterius in ea parte rite et legitime procedentes ipsum reverendum patrem dominum Richardum Norwicensem episcopum, ad comparendum istis die et loco qui consistorio proximus est causam rationabilem et legitimam, si quam pro se habuerit vel dicere sciverit quare nos contra eundem reverendum[fol. 139v.]<sup>40</sup> patrem Norwicensem episcopum ad declarationem pene contumacie sue huiusmodi procedere et eandem contumaciam iuxta iuris exigentiam punire non debeamus in debita iuris forma, dicturum, ostensurum, allegaturum et propositurum etiam legitime et peremptorie citatum, publice preconisatum diutiusque expectatum et non legitime comparentem nec causam sufficientem dicentem, ostendentem, allegantem seu proponentem, denuo pronunciamus contumacem ac dictam contumaciam sic duximus puniendam, videlicet dicto reverendo patri, ob<sup>41</sup> dictam contumaciam, domino Richardo Norwicensi episcopo in penam contumacie sue huiusmodi ecclesie sue sacerdotale ministerium interdicimus

in his scriptis, penam contumacie sue predictae in ea parte per presentes declarando et declaramus.

POSTEA vero tertio die mensis Octobris anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo quarto coram dicto commissario in prioratu Sancti Olavi Norwicensis diocesis loco capitulari ibidem, in presencia mei Edmundi Clifton scribe sue, sedenti comparuit personaliter Magister Willelmus Talmach procurator et eo nomine dicti reverendi patris domini Richardi Norwicensis episcopi. Pro quo quidem reverendo patre procuratorium suum litteratorie conceptum et sigillo eiusdem reverendi patris, ut apparuit, sigillatum exhibuit et fecit se partem pro eodem et allegavit absenciam dicti reverendi patris domini sui ex causis insertis in eodem procuratorio, ac decretum interdicti alias pro contumacia eiusdem reverendi patris in non comparendo certis die et loco contra eundem alias lati petiit relaxari, et obtulit se promptum et paratum in animum dicti domini sui iurare quod dominus suus parebit iuri stabitque mandatis ecclesie et peraget penitenciam pro contumacia sua iuxta et secundum iuris exigentiam et arbitrium dicti reverendissimi patris archiepiscopi Cant' seu eius commissarii. Quem sic offerentem et petentem dictus dominus commissarius, tactis per eundem procuratorem sacrosanctis Dei evangeliiis in animam dicti reverendi patris Norwicensis episcopi domini sui, ...<sup>42</sup> quod ille ipse dominus suus parebit iuri et stabit mandatis ecclesie et<sup>43</sup> quod peraget penitenciam pro dicta contumacia per prefatum reverendissimum patrem seu eius commissarium iniungendam decimo nono die mensis

Octobris nunc instantis in ecclesia parochiali de Hoxne dicte diocesis ante meridiem eiusdem diei, cum continuatione et prorogatione dierum et locorum si oporteat, et monuit eundem reverendum patrem in persona procuratoris sui ad comparandum ipsis die et loco penitentiam predictam recepturum. Et statim tunc et ibidem dictus commissarius ex certis causis eundem moventibus potestatem relaxandi interdicti decretum domino Willelmo Dale priori prioratus tunc et ibidem comisit virtute eiusdem commissionis. Idem prior adtunc et ibidem presens prefati interdicti decretum tunc et ibidem relaxavit. Tenor vero dicti procuratorii per Magistrum Willelmum Talmache ut prefertur exhibiti sequitur et est talis:

PATEAT UNIVERSIS per presentes quod nos Richardus permissione divina Norwicensis episcopus visu corporali (disponente Domino) orbato et destituto,<sup>44</sup> octogenarii et ultra, corporisque et virium confractorum, dilectos nobis in Christo Magistros Willelmum Talmache in legibus baccalaureum et Rogerum Kent notarium publicum coniunctim et divisim nostros veros et legitimos procuratores, actores, factores negotiorumque nostrorum gestores et nuncios speciales ordinamus, facimus et constituimus per presentes. Damusque et concedimus eisdem procuratoribus nostris coniunctim ut prefertur et divisim potestatem generalem et mandatum speciale pro nobis et nomine nostro coram reverendissimo in Christo patre et domino domino Thoma permissione divina Cantuariensi archiepiscopo, totius Anglie primate et metropolitano eiusque commissario sive commissariis quibuscumque comparendi absenciamque nostram personalem excusandi,

allegandi et proponendi ac causam et causas absencie nostre  
huiusmodi allegandi et similiter proponendi, et si opus<sup>45</sup>  
fuerit probandi; quodcumque insuper iuramentum licitum et  
honestum ac canonicum ac de iure in hac parte requisitum in  
animam nostram prestandi, subeundi et iurandi necnon beneficium  
absolutionis a quibuscumque sentenciis, sensuris et penis  
ecclesiasticis de iure vel ab homine latis seu ferendis petendi  
et obtinendi (nolumus tamen<sup>46</sup> aliquos procuratores per nos in  
hac parte prius constitutos revocari nec revocamus per  
presentes) ET GENERALITER omnia alia et singula faciendi,  
exercendi et expediendi que in premissis necessaria fuerint  
seu quomodolibet oportuna, etiamsi mandatum magis exigant speciale  
quam presentibus est expressum, promittentes ratum, gratum et  
firmum perpetuo habituros quicquid per dictos nostros  
procuratores seu eorum alterum actum, gestum sive procuratum  
fuerit.<sup>47</sup> In cuius rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus  
apposuimus. Dat' penultimo die mensis Septembris in manerio  
nostro de Horne anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo  
quarto.<sup>48</sup>

Dicto xix<sup>o</sup> die mensis Octobris anno Domini quo  
supra prefatus commissarius in ecclesia parochiali de Horne  
predicta, in mei Edmundi Cliston notarii publici presencia,  
sedens prefatum reverendum patrem episcopum Norwicensem  
preconizari fecit; quem sic preconizatum et non comparentem  
duxerit expectandum usque ad finem contionis. Et statim post  
contionem huiusmodi tunc et ibidem [fol. 140] comparuit personaliter  
dictus reverendus pater Norwicensis episcopus et ad eiusdem  
rogatum et requisitionem, idem commissarius unacum episcopo

huiusmodi ad sacarium sive vestibulum eiusdem ecclesie se contulit. Et tunc et ibidem causam sue comparationis<sup>49</sup> eidem episcopo declaravit. Post cuius declarationem, idem commissarius de consensu eiusdem episcopi continuavit negotium huiusmodi usque ad horam tertiam post meridiem eiusdem diei ac etiam prorogavit locum huiusmodi ad manerium suum de Horne predictum. Dicta hora tertia adveniente, dicti commissarii et episcopus in quodam inferiori cubiculo eiusdem manerii constituti, habita certa communicatione inter eisdem, tandem episcopus antedictus consentiit recipere dictum commissarium in visitatorem seu alterum quemcumque nomine dicti reverendissimi ad eundem mittendum, finem negotii huiusmodi peracturum pro loco et tempore arbitrio dicti reverendissimi patris seu eius commissarii limitandis et assignandis.

- [<sup>1</sup>sequuntur in MS.      <sup>2</sup>fuiert in MS.      <sup>3</sup>penam in MS.  
<sup>4</sup>peremp[fol. 138]torie in MS.; ibidem...peremptorie marked by a pencil cross in the margin. The text of fol. 138 is marked by a vertical pencil line and crosses in the margin.  
<sup>5</sup>reservaviert in MS.      <sup>6</sup>quatenus repeated and underlined in ink on its first occurrence in MS.      <sup>7</sup>Norwicensis...vicesimo underlined in ink and marked with a cross in the margin.  
<sup>8</sup>comparuiert in MS.      <sup>9</sup>procedentes in MS.      <sup>10</sup>continacia in MS.      <sup>11</sup>et loco interlined as a correction in MS.  
<sup>12</sup>et...secundo underlined in ink and marked in the margin.  
<sup>13</sup>ad...ecclesie underlined in ink and marked in the margin of the MS.      <sup>14</sup>comparuit...Thomas underlined in ink; Capp is written in ink in the margin.      <sup>15</sup>comparitionem in MS.      <sup>16</sup>competentem quovismodo underlined in pencil.      <sup>17</sup>Corrected from Thomas.  
<sup>18</sup>competente in MS.      <sup>19</sup>fuiert in MS.      <sup>20</sup>episcopum episcopum in MS.      <sup>21</sup>dictas in MS.      <sup>22</sup>Commissarium vos dicente in MS.; meaning unclear.      <sup>23</sup>diffeceor in MS.      <sup>24</sup>iudex...incompetens



- underlined in pencil and marked in the margin. <sup>25</sup>gu in MS.  
<sup>26</sup>tum in MS. <sup>27</sup>legitime underlined in pencil and marked  
in the margin; legitime also written in pencil in the margin.  
<sup>28</sup>competit...commissario underlined in pencil. <sup>29</sup>suspensionis  
...persona underlined in pencil and marked by vertical lines in  
ink and pencil in the margin. <sup>30</sup>vel omitted in MS.  
<sup>31</sup>Corrected in MS. from adhere. <sup>32</sup>et omitted in MS.  
<sup>33</sup>Corrected in MS. from adhere. <sup>34</sup>et omitted in MS.  
<sup>35</sup>emagenate in MS.; meaning unclear. <sup>36</sup>contram in MS.  
<sup>37</sup>fuiert in MS. <sup>38</sup>se in MS. <sup>39</sup>videlicet...reverendum  
marked by a vertical line in the margin. <sup>40</sup>reverendum  
[fol. 139v.] reverendum in MS. <sup>41</sup>ob omitted in MS.; dictam  
contumaciam underlined in ink. <sup>42</sup>iuravit in MS.; properly  
iurare fecit? <sup>43</sup>et quod...contumacia underlined in ink;  
penitenciam written in ink in the margin. <sup>44</sup>orbati et  
destitut... in MS. <sup>45</sup>fuiert in MS. <sup>46</sup>tamem in MS.  
<sup>47</sup>fuiert in MS. <sup>48</sup>tricesimo quarto underlined in pencil.  
<sup>49</sup>comparitionis in MS.]



British Library, Additional MS. 48022;

Extracts from a copy of Thomas Cromwell's

Register as vicegerent

1[fol. 85]

[15 Oct. 1535. Mandate from the crown to the dean or president  
and chapter of Hereford to enthrone Edward Fox as their new  
bishop]

Henricus octavus [eto.]<sup>1</sup> dilecto nobis decano sive presidenti  
et capitulo ecclesie cathedralis Herefordensis, salutem.  
Quia reverendissimus in Christo pater Thomas Cant' archiepiscopus  
in negotio confirmationis electionis de persona reverendi  
patris Edwardi Fox sacre theologie professoris in episcopum  
Herefordensis ecclesie per nos nominatum et commendatum<sup>2</sup> ac  
per decanum sive presidentem et capitulum ecclesie cathedralis  
Herefordensis predictae rite electum, servatis per eum de iure  
in ea parte servandis, legitime per omnia procedens electionem  
huiusmodi debite confirmavit, ac eundem etiam reverendum  
patrem, servatis per eum servandis, debite consecravit,  
quibus quidem electioni, confirmationi et consecrationi nos  
assensum et consensum nostrum regium adhibuimus et favorem,  
vobis igitur committimus ac firmiter iniungendo mandamus  
quatenus prenominatum electum, confirmatum<sup>3</sup> et consecratum seu  
eius procuratorem legitimum ad et in realem, actuales et  
corporalem possessionem diete ecclesie cathedralis Herefordensis  
et dignitatis episcopalis eiusdem cum omnibus suis honoribus,  
privilegiis, prerogativis, preeminenciis ac iuribus et  
pertinenciis suis universis<sup>4</sup> iuxta et secundum prefate ecclesie  
statuta et approbatas consuetudines atque preteriti temporis  
morem inducat, installat et cum plenitudine iuris episcopalis

in eadem inthronizetis, locumque in capitulo sibi assignetis, ceteraque faciatis que in premissis seu circa ea necessaria fuerit seu quomodolibet oportuna. In cuius rei testimonium sigillum nostrum quo ad causas ecclesiasticas utimur presentibus apponi mandavimus. Dat' decimo quinto die mensis Octobris anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo quinto et regni nostri xxvii<sup>mo</sup>.

[<sup>1</sup>Mandatum ad installandum episcopum Herefordensem appears as a marginal heading. <sup>2</sup>commendatu in MS. <sup>3</sup>confirmatu in MS. <sup>4</sup>universalis in MS.]

2[fols 88-88A]

[31 Dec. 1535. Commission from the crown to Miles Spenser and [unnamed] to exercise spiritual jurisdiction in the diocese of Norwich sede vacante]

Henricus[etq.]<sup>1</sup> dilectis nobis Miloni Spenser legum doctori et[blank] salutem. Cum nos alias iure nostro clerum totius regni nostri visitare intendentes reverendissimo patri ac predilecto consiliario nostro Thome Cant' archiepiscopo ac per eum aliis huius regni nostri episcopis quibuscunque, ne ipsi aut eorum aliquis quioquam iurisdictionis visitatione nostra huiusmodi pendente exorcere attentarent sive attentaret, per literas nostras inhibuerimus, ac subinde quia predilectus nobis Thomas Crumwell, secretarius noster primarius ac rotulorum sive scriniorum<sup>2</sup> nostrorum magister et custos atque ad causas ecclesiasticas quascunque nostra autoritate uti supremi

capitis diote ecclesie Anglicane quomodolibet tractandas sive ventilandas vicem gerens, vicarius generalis et officialis principalis, nostris et huius regni nostri Anglie tot et tam arduis negotiis adeo preeditus existebat...<sup>3</sup> ad omnem jurisdictionem nobis uti supremo capiti huiusmodi competentem ubique locorum infra hoc nostrum regnum, et presertim in his que moram commode non patiuntur aut sine subditorum nostrorum iniuria differi non possunt, in sua persona expediendam<sup>4</sup> non sufficiebat, Richardo nuper Norwicensi episcopo vices nostras sub certis modo et forma, tunc in quibusdam[fol. 88v.] aliis litteris nostris sibi in ea parte directis, specificatis commisserimus, ipsumque ad exercendum iurisdictionem ecclesiasticam aliaque faciendum sub nobis licentiaverimus prout in eisdem litteris nostris plenius continetur. Quia tamen dictus Richardus nuper Norwicensis episcopus viam universi carnis est ingressus et<sup>5</sup> dictus Thomas Crumwell nostris et dicti regni nostri Anglie tot et tam arduis negotiis adhuc preeditus existat quod ad iurisdictionem predictam sede episcopali predicta vacante in dicta diocese Norwicensi in sua persona expediendum non sufficiet, vobis igitur vices suas in hac parte commiserit vosque substituerit. Nos commissionem et substitutionem huiusmodi sic ab eo factam ratam et gratam habentes, vobis coniunctim et devisim sub modo et forma inferius descriptis pro tempore vacationis huiusmodi<sup>6</sup> ad probandum, approbandum et insinuandum testamenta et ultimas voluntates quorumcunque subditorum nostrorum diote Norwicensis diocesis bona, iura sive credita non ultra summam centum librarum vite et mortis suarum tempore habentium nec non administrationes

bonorum quorumcumque subditorum nostrorum eiusdem diocesis ab intestato decedentium, quorum bona, iura sive credita non ultra summam predictam vite et mortis suarum tempore sese extendent (quatenus huiusmodi testamentorum approbatio atque administrationis concessio per episcopos Norwicensis aut eorum alicuius respective commissarios retroactis temporibus fiebat ac fieri et committi potuit et non aliter), committendum, ac calculum ratiociniumque et alia in ea parte expediendum, nec non presentatos ad beneficia<sup>7</sup> ecclesiastica quecumque infra diocesim Norwicensem predictam constitutos, si ad curam beneficiis huiusmodi imminentem sustinendam habiles reperti fuerint et idonei et non aliter, admittendum ac in et de eisdem instituendum et investiendum, ac etiam si res ita exigit destituendum,<sup>8</sup> causasque lites et negotia coram dicto nuper Norwicensi episcopo aut eius deputatis vel eorum aliquo pendentia indecisa, nec non alias sive alia quasoumque sive quecumque ad forum ecclesiasticum pertinentia ad vos seu ad vestrum alterum<sup>9</sup> per viam querele, appellationis aut aliter devolvenda sive deducenda, que citra legum nostrarum et statutorum<sup>10</sup> regni nostri offensiones coram vobis aut vestrum altero vigore huius commissionis nostre agitari, devolvi aut deduci valeant<sup>11</sup> et possint, examinandum et decidendum, aliaque omnia et singula iurisdictionis ecclesiastice administrationem concernentia, que predictus nuper Norwicensis episcopus vigore commissionis alias eidem a nobis directe explicare seu facere poterat, exercendum ac cetera etiam omnia et singula in premissis seu circa ea necessaria vel quomodolibet

opportuna vice, nomine et autoritate nostris exequendum  
 vobis coniunctim et devisim, de<sup>12</sup> quorum doctrina viteque et  
 morum integritate plurimum confidimus, vices nostras committimus  
 ac liberam tenore presentium concedimus facultatem, vosque  
 nostros in hac parte commissarios coniunctim et devisim  
 preficimus et deputamus per presentes ad nostrum beneplacitum  
 duraturas cum cuiuslibet congrue et ecclesiastice coercionis  
 potestate, assumpto vobis et utrique vestrum dilecto subdito  
 nostro Thoma Godsalsa notario publico in actorum vestrorum  
 scribam. In cuius rei testimonium sigillum nostrum quo ad  
 causas ecclesiasticas utimur presentibus apponi mandavimus.  
 Dat' ultimo die mensis Decembris anno Domini millesimo  
 quingentesimo tricesimo quinto et regni nostri vicesimo  
 septimo.

[<sup>1</sup> Commissio ad exercendum iurisdictionem sede episcopali

Norwicensi vacante is given as a heading to the commission in MS.

<sup>2</sup> scribentium in MS.

<sup>3</sup> que in MS.; properly quod?

<sup>4</sup> expedienda in MS.

<sup>5</sup> et omitted in MS.

<sup>6</sup> committimus

in MS.; but cf. below.

<sup>7</sup> beneficia in MS.

<sup>8</sup> distituendum in MS.

<sup>9</sup> aliquem erased in MS.

<sup>10</sup> sta [fol. 88A]

statutorum in MS.

<sup>11</sup> valeat in MS.

<sup>12</sup> de suprascript as

a contemporary correction in MS.]

3 [fol. 94v.]

[4 May, 1537. Mandate from the crown to the archdeacon or  
 president and chapter of Llandaff to enthrone Robert Holgate as  
 their new bishop]

HENRICUS [etc.]<sup>1</sup> dilectis nobis archidiacono sive presidenti  
et capitulo ecclesie nostre cathedralis Landavensis,<sup>2</sup> salutem.  
Quia reverendissimus in Christo pater Thomas Cantuar'  
archiepiscopus in negotio confirmationis electionis de persona  
reverendi patris Roberti in episcopum Landavensis ecclesie  
per nos nominati et commendati atque per archidiaconum sive  
presidentem et capitulum diote ecclesie cathedralis Landavensis  
rite electi, servatis per eum de iure in ea parte servandis,  
legitime per omnia procedens electionem huiusmodi debite  
confirmavit ac eundem etiam reverendum patrem, servatis per  
eum debite servandis,<sup>3</sup> debite[fol. 95] confirmavit,<sup>4</sup> quibus  
quidem electioni, confirmationi et consecrationi nos assensum  
et consensum nostrum regium adhibuimus et favorem, vobis  
igitur committimus ac firmiter iniungendo mandamus quatenus  
prenominatum electum, confirmatum et consecratum seu eius  
procuratorem legitimum ad et in realem et corporalem possessionem  
diote ecclesie cathedralis Landavensis et dignitatis episcopalis  
eiusdem cum omnibus suis honoribus, privilegiis, prerogativis,  
preeminenciis ac iuribus et pertinenciis suis universis iuxta  
et secundum prefate ecclesie statuta et approbatas consuetudines  
atque preterriti temporis morem inducatis, installatis et  
cum plenitudine iuris episcopalis in eadem inthronizatis,  
locumque in capitulo sibi assignetis ceteraque faciatis et  
exequamini que in premissis seu circa ea necessaria fuerint seu  
quomodolibet oportuna. In cuius rei testimonium presentes  
litteras nostras inde fieri sigillique nostri ad causas  
ecclesiasticas appensione communiri mandavimus. Dat' quarto

die mensis Maii anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo trigesimo  
septimo et regni nostri anno vicesimo nono.

[<sup>1</sup>Mandatum ad installandum et inthronizandum episcopum  
Landavensem entered as a heading in MS. <sup>2</sup>Landavensem  
in MS. <sup>3</sup>servandis omitted in MS. <sup>4</sup>Properly consecravit?  
cf. 1; Holgate was consecrated on 25 March 1537; cf. H.B.C.,  
p. 277]



GLOSSARY of manuscript forms of PLACE NAMES and PERSONAL NAMES

It has not always been possible to include every variant spelling of all surnames in Calendars. Such manuscript forms have been collected in the GLOSSARY below. Within the text of Calendars, all place names have been given in their modern form. All manuscript forms not given in Transcripts have been collected in the GLOSSARY. Where the term also appears in parentheses, the form used as the standard form in the GLOSSARY also appears in the MS. For example, Lewis, John(also Lewys, Lewes) means that all three forms of the personal name appear in the MS.

In identifying place names, the standard authority is O. Mason, Bartholomew: Gazetteer of Britain(Edinburgh, 1977). The spelling of the deaneries of immediate jurisdiction and the identification of London parishes have been facilitated by The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, edited by E.F. Jacob and H.C. Johnson(Canterbury and York Society, 42, 45-7, 1938-47). For the identification of manor houses, The Victoria History of the county of Hertford, vol. III, ed. by W. Page (London, 1912) and The Victoria History of the county of Bedford, vol. III, ed. by W. Page(London, 1912) have been useful. For religious houses, the standard work is D. Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales(London, 1952).

In establishing a standard form for certain personal names in the GLOSSARY, the following works have been consulted: Dictionary of

National Biography, ed. by L. Stephen and S. Lee, 72 vols  
(London, 1885-1913); G. Cokayne, The complete peerage, new  
revised and enlarged ed. by V. Gibbs[et al.] 13 vols(London,  
1910-59); The History of Parliament: The House of Commons  
1509-1558, ed. in 3 vols for The History of Parliament Trust  
by S.T. Bindoff(London, 1982); J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae  
Anglicanae 1300-1541, revised ed., 12 vols(London, 1962-7);  
J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857, revised ed.,  
5 vols(London, 1969-79).

A

Adisham(Addisham)[Kent]  
 Alambygg, Nicholas(also Alambrigge)  
 Alexander, Peter(also Allexander).  
 Audley, Sir Thomas, Baron Audley of Walden(also Audeley)

B

Bangor(Bangor', Bangoria; Banger, Bangor)[Gwynedd]  
 Bekesbourne(Bekysborne)[Kent]  
 Berkhamsted(Barkamsted)[Herts]  
 Blakesware, manor of(Blakis Ware)[Herts]  
 Bocher, Thomas(also Bucher)  
 Booher, Thomas(also Bowcher)  
 Booking, deanery of(also Bockynge)[Essex]  
 Bologna(Bononia)  
 Briggess, Edward(also Bigges, Bygges)  
 Broun, Humphrey(also Browne)  
 Butler, John(also Butlar)  
 Buxted(also Buxstede, Buxsted)[East Sussex]

C

Calais(Calisia, Calesia, Caletum, Calitia)  
 Canterbury(Cant', Cant, Cantuar', Cantuar, Cantur', Cantr',  
Cantr; also Canturbury, Canterburie)[Kent]  
 Cappe, Thomas(also Capp)  
 Cheyne, Sir Thomas(Cheyney, Chayney)  
 Cheshunt(Chesthunt, Cesthunte)[Herts]  
 Chester(Cestria)[Cheshire]  
 Clifton, Edmund(also Cliston)

Cockes, John(also Cocokes, Cockis)  
 Cooke, William(also Coke)  
 Cranmer, Edmund(Cranmere)  
 Cranmer, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury(also Cramer)  
 Crayford(Eard, Earde alias Crayforde)[London]  
 Cromwell, Sir Thomas, Baron Cromwell, Earl of Essex(Crumwell)

D

Daye, Thomas(also Dey)  
 Dorset(Dorsset, Dorssett)  
 Dover(Dovor')[Kent]

E

East Grinstead(Est Grenested, Est Grenestede, Estgrenstede,  
Estgrensted)[West Sussex]  
 East Horsley(Easthorsley, Easthorsey)[Surrey]  
 England(Anglia; Englande)  
 Eton College(Collegium de Eton, Eaton)[Beds]  
 Exeter(Exon')[Devon]

F

Ford(Forde); the archbishop's manor, in Hoath[Kent]  
 France(Francia, Frauncia, Gallia; Fraunce)  
 Fuller, John(also Fuller)

G

Glasgow(Glascou')[Stratholyde]  
 Glasyer, Hugh(also Glasior)

Great Horkeley(Horsley magna)[Essex]

Greenwich(Grenewyche)[London]

## H

Harryson, George(also Harison)

Hereford(Herforde)[Hereford and Worcester]

High Holborn(High Holborne)[London]

Hollywell, Maud(also Holiwell, Holywell)

Hoxne(also Hoxon)[Suffolk]

## I

Ickwell Bury, manor of(Ikwelbury, Iokwelburye)[Beds]

Ireland(Hibernia; Irelande)

## K

Kaye, Thomas(also Key)

Kent(Kant', Kantia)

Kings Langley(Langle Regis)[Herts]

Kingston(Kingeston)[Kent]

## L

Lambeth(also Lambith, Lambhith, Lambehith, Lambeith, Lamhith,  
Lambehythe, Lambehithe, Lambithe, Lamehith, Lamhithhe)  
 [London]

Layton, Richard(also Lagton)

Lewis, John(also Lewys, Lewes)

Leyson, Griffin(also Layson)

Lichfield(Lich')[Staffs]

Lincoln(Lincoln'; Lincoln, Lincolne)[Lincs]

Lingham, Peter(also Langham, Ligham)

London(London', London, Lodon, Londinum; also Londonne)

churches in, All Hallows Lombard St(Omnium Sanctorum in  
Lumbard Street, in le Lumbarde Streate, in Lombartstrete)

St Dionis Backchurch(Sancti Dionisii)

St Dunstan in the East(Sancti Dunstani in Orienti)

St John the Evangelist, Watling St(Sancti Johannis  
in Watlinge Street, Sancti Johannis Evangeliste in le  
Wattlyng Streate, in Watlyngstrete)

St Mary Bothaw(Beate Marie Botolphi)

St Mary le Bow(Beate Marie de Archibus)

St Pancras(Sancti Pancrasii)

St Paul's cathedral(ecclesia cathedralis domini Pauli London';  
ecclesia Sancti Pauli London'; Sancti Pauli; ecclesia  
cathedralis Sancti Pauli London')

# M

Merioneth(Meryoneth)[Gwynedd]

Morpeth, Richard(also Morpeth)

# N

Nevinson, Christopher(also Nevenson, Levinson)

Northill(Northeel)[Beds]

# O

Oxford(Oxon')[Oxon]

# P

Paget, Sir William, Lord Paget of Beaudesert(also Pagett)

Pagham, deanery of(also Pageham)[West Sussex]

Paisley(Pasletum)[Stratholyde]

Petworth(Petworthe)[West Sussex]

Preston next Faversham(Preston, Preston iuxta Faversham)[Kent]

Prittlewell, priory of(Prytelwod)[Essex]

Pyttes, Arthur(also Pittes)

## R

Rich, Sir Richard, Lord Rich(Riohe, Ryche)

Risborough, deanery of(Risburghe, Risburgh, Risbergh)[Bucks]

Ryve, Richard(also Reve)

## S

Salisbury(Sarum)[Wilts]

Say, William(also Saye)

Scotland(Sootia)

Seymour, Edward, Earl of Hertford, Duke of Somerset(Somerset,  
Somersett, Sommersett)

Shoreham, deanery of(also Shorham)[Kent]

Smythe, Thomas(also Smyth)

South Malling, deanery of(Sowthmallinge, Sowthmalling, Sowthmallyng,

Southmalling, Sowthmallynge)[East Sussex]

Sussex(Sussex'; Sussex)

## T

Tarring, deanery of(Terringe, Terring, Tarryng)[West Sussex]

Taunton(Tawnton)[Somerset]

Talmach, William(also Talmache)

Tayler, Robert(also Taylor)

Tregonwell, Sir John(also Tregunwell)

## U

Uckfield(Tuckfelde, Tuckefelde, Tuckefielde, Uckfelde,

Uokefelde, Wiokefelde)[East Sussex]

## W

Walker, William(also Walber, Walbere)

Waltham Cross(Waltham Sanote Crucis)[Herts]

Warden-in-Isle-of-Sheppey(Warden, Warden infra insulam de  
Sohapeia)[Kent]

Warham, William, archbishop of Canterbury(also Wharham)

West Hithe(Hithe)[Kent]

Westminster(Westm', Westmon', Westm, Westmonasterium)[London]

St Stephen's college(collegium regium Sancti Stephani  
prothomartiris prope palacium regium Westmon')

Willet, Thomas(also Wyllet)

Willoughby, Sir Thomas(also Willoubiy, Willoughby)

Winchester(Winton')[Hants]

Wingfield, Sir Anthony(Winkfyld, Winkfeld, Wyngefelde, Wingefelde)

Woodford(Wodford)[Northants]

Worcester(Wigorn')[Hereford and Worcester]

Wotton, Nicholas(also Wutton)

Wryght, Walter(also Wryghte, Wright)

## Y

York(Yorke)[N. Yorks]



Unidentified forms of place names

Corden

Charlewoode

BIBLIOGRAPHYPRIMARY SOURCES IN MANUSCRIPTThe Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York University

Register 28 [Register of Edward Lee, 1531-44]

Register 29 [Registers of Robert Holgate, 1545-54,  
and Nicholas Heath, 1555-59]

Inst. AB. 1 [Institution Act Book, 1545-68]

The British Library

Additional MS. 48022 [copies of ecclesiastical  
commissions; fols 83-96 comprise a copy  
of Thomas Cromwell's Register as Vice-Gerent]

Additional MS. 48040, fols 13-102v. [a copy of the  
revised code of canon law under Henry VIII]

Cotton MS. Cleopatra E VI

Cotton MS. Cleopatra F II

Harleian MS. 426 [Thomas Cranmer's copy of the  
Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum]

Harleian MS. 4990

Lansdowne MS. 989

MSS Royal 7B XI, XII [Commonplace Books of Thomas  
Cranmer]

Additional Charter 8056

Cotton Charter X. 13

Sloane Charter XXXII.1

The Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS. Oxf. dioc. papers d. 105 [a composite  
volume, containing the Register of Robert  
King, 1542-57]

MS. Ch. Lincoln 1378

Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library

Register T<sup>2</sup> [Cartulary of the prior and chapter  
1533-40]

Register U [Cartulary of the dean and chapter  
1541-53]

Register N [Sede vacante Register following the  
Thomas Cranmer's deprivation in 1553]

Register V1[a miscellaneous Register containing  
both sede vacante and capitular material]

Christ Church Letters, 3 vols

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

MS. 102, fols 151-93[Thomas Cranmer's compilation  
De Re Sacramentaria]

MS. 106

The Guildhall Library, Aldermanbury, London

MS. 9531/11[Register of John Stokesley, 1530-9]

MS. 9531/12, pt 1 fols 1-241v.[Register of  
Edmund Bonner, 1539-49]

MS. 9531/12, pt 2 fols 242-75[Register of  
Thomas Thirlby, bishop of Westminster 1540-50]

Lincoln Archive Office

Register XXVI, XXVII[part of the Registers of  
John Longland, 1521-47, and Henry Holbeach,  
1547-51]

Register XXVIII[a composite volume, recording  
institutions 1541-70. The separate portions  
of this volume were discovered by Canon  
C.W. Foster]

Dvj/24/4

Dean and Chapter Wills, vol. II[a compilation  
which contains non-testamentary material]

Lambeth Palace Library

Thomas Cranmer's Register

Henry Deane's Register[part of Deane's Register  
is bound in with the Register of John  
Morton, vol. II, fols 169-71]

John Kempe's Register[bound in with the Register  
of John Stafford]

John Morton's Register, 2 vols

John Stafford's Register[bound in with the  
Register of John Kempe]

William Warham's Register, 2 vols

MS. 1107[Commonplace Book of Thomas Cranmer;  
fols 1-75v comprise Bishop Cranmer's  
Collections of the laws]

MS. 1108[Commonplace Book of Thomas Cranmer]

MS. 1641, fols 98-117[Lecture on diocesan Registers  
and The Canterbury and York Society, delivered  
by Dr C. Jenkins at the Jubilee Meeting of  
the Society in 1954]

V.G./4/1 [Court Book of the vicar general]

Indexes to the Registers at Lambeth Palace  
Library covering the period from John Pecham  
to Thomas Herring compiled in 67 volumes  
by A.C. Ducarel

Norfolk and Norwich Record Office

Registers 9/14, 10/16, 11/17 [the later portions  
of the Register of Richard Nykke, 1501-35,  
Vacancy Register 1535-6, Register of  
William Repps, 1536-50]  
Register 12/18, fols 1-5v [First Series], 1-82  
[Second Series] [Register of Thomas Thirlby,  
1550-54]

ORR/1A [Ordinations Register 1532-61]

Dean and Chapter Muniments, Liber Miscellaneorum 2  
Dean and Chapter Muniments, Chartae et Statuta  
Ecclesiae Cathedralis Norwicensis

The Public Record Office

C. 82 [Chancery warrants for the Great Seal]  
E. 25 [Exchequer: Treasury of the Receipt;  
Acknowledgements of Supremacy]

E 30[Exchequer: Treasury of the Receipt;  
Diplomatic Documents]

E 36[Exchequer: Treasury of the Receipt;  
Books]

SP/1 and SP/2[State Papers, domestic and  
foreign, of the reign of Henry VIII]:

SP 1/ 71, 83, 85, 91, 96, 99, 141;

SP 2/ N, P.

University Library of Cambridge

E.D.R., G/1/7 and G/1/8, fols 1-22v.[Register  
of Thomas Goodrich, 1534-54]

E.P.R., Liber H

West Sussex Record Office, Chichester

Ep. I/1/6[Registers of Richard Sampson, 1536-43;  
George Day, 1543-51; 1553-56; John Scory,  
1552-3]

These Registers are available on microfilm at The Borthwick  
Institute of Historical Research, York University, as MF 121.

PRIMARY SOURCES IN PRINT

Acts of the Privy Council of England A.D. 1542-1631, New Series, 46 vols(London, 1890-1964)

Articles devised by the holle consent of the Kynges moste honourable counsayle, printed in N. Pocock,  
Records of the Reformation: The Divorce 1527-1533.  
2 vols(Oxford, 1870)

The Autobiography of the Emperer Charles V, translated into English by L.F. Simpson(London, 1862)

Bramhall, J., Works, ed. in 5 vols by A.W. Haddan(London, 1842-5)

Bucer, M., Scripta Anglicana(Basel, 1577)

Burnet, G., History of the reformation of the Church of England, ed. by N. Pocock in 7 vols(Oxford, 1865)

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters...1198-1492.  
14 vols, ed. by W.H. Bliss, C. Johnson and J.A. Twemlow(London, 1893-1960)

Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers relating to the negotiations between England and Spain[from the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary, 1485-1558] ed. in 13 vols by G. Bergenroth, P. de Gayangos, M.A.S. Hume and R. Tyler(London, 1862-1954) and 2 Supplements ed. by G.A. Bergenroth and G. Mattingly(London, 1868-1940)

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English affairs[Venetian] 1202-1675, ed. in 38 vols by R. Brown,



G. Cavendish Bentinck, H.F. Brown and A.B. Hinds  
(London, 1864-1940)

Calendar of state papers, domestic series, of the reigns  
of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth [ & James I ] 1547-(1625),  
ed. by R. Lemon and M.A.E. Green, 12 vols(London,  
1856-72)

Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office:  
Edward VI, 6 vols(London, 1924-29)

Chambers, D.S., Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549(Oxford, 1966)

Chapter Acts of the Cathedral Church of St Mary of Lincoln  
A.D. 1520-1559, ed. by R.E.G. Cole(Lincoln Record  
Society, 12-13, 15, 1915-20)

Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London, ed. for The Camden  
Society by J.G. Nichols(London, 1852)

Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical 1604, ed. by J.V.  
Bullard(London, 1934)

Corpus Iuris Canonici. Editio Lipsiensis secunda post  
Aemilii Ludovici Richter curas, ed. in 2 vols  
by E. Friedberg(Graz, 1879)

Cranmer, T., Remains, ed. in 4 vols by H. Jenkyns(Oxford, 1833)

— Works, ed. in 2 vols for The Parker Society by J.E. Cox,  
(Cambridge, 1844-6)

Cranmer's liturgical projects, ed. from British Museum MS. Royal  
7 B IV by J.W. Legg for The Henry Bradshaw Society  
(London, 1915)

Deane, H., [Part of his Register], calendared in J.C.C. Smith,  
Index of Wills proved in the Prerogative Court of  
Canterbury 1383-1558(British Record Society, Index  
Library 10, 1893), pp. xvi-xix.

- Douglas, S., lord Glenbervie, Diaries, ed. in 2 vols  
by F. Bickley (London, 1928)
- Ellis, H., Original Letters illustrative of English History  
3rd Series, 4 vols (London, 1846)
- An Episcopal Court Book for the diocese of Lincoln, ed. by  
M. Bowker (Lincoln Record Society, LXI, 1967)
- Foxe, J., Acts and Monuments, ed. in 8 vols by J. Pratt (London,  
1877)
- Gardiner, S., De vera obedientia, printed in P. Janelle,  
Obedience in Church and State (Cambridge, 1930),  
pp. 67-171
- Gee H., and Hardy, W.J., Documents illustrative of English  
Church History (London, 1896)
- Gibson, E., Codex juris ecclesiastici Anglicani, 2 vols (London,  
1713)
- Codex Iuris Ecclesiastici Anglicani, 2 vols (Oxford, 1761)
- A Glasse of the Truthe, printed in N. Pocock, Records of the  
Reformation: The Divorce 1527-1533, 2 vols  
(Oxford, 1870)
- Hall, E., Chronicle: containing the history of England during  
the reign of Henry the Fourth and the succeeding  
monarchs to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth  
(London, 1809)
- Harpsfield, N., A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce between  
Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, ed. by N. Pocock  
(Camden Society, New Series, XXI, 1878)
- House of Commons, Sessional Papers, vol. LVII ([London],  
1867-8), pp. 1, 75-214.

Journals of the House of Commons, vol. 1-(London, 1803)

Journals of the House of Lords, vol. 1-(London, 1846-)

Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of

Henry VIII...[A Calendar], ed. by J.S. Brewer,

J. Gairdner and R.H. Brodie, 21 vols(London, 1862-

1910); vol. 1[rev. ed.](1920); Addenda 1 vol.(1929-32)

The Letters of William. Lord Paget of Beaudesert, 1547-63

ed. by B.L. Beer and S.M. Jack in Camden Miscellany.

vol. XXV, published by The Royal Historical Society

(Camden Fourth Series, 13), pp. 1-141

The life and letters of Thomas Cromwell, ed. by R.B. Merriman

in 2 vols(Oxford, 1902)

The Lisle Letters, ed. in 6 vols by M. St Clare Byrne

(Chicago, 1981)

A Little Treatise against the muttering of some papists in

corners, published in N. Pocock, Records of the

Reformation: The Divorce 1527-1533, 2 vols(Oxford,

1870)

Luther, M., Works, ed. in 54 vols and one companion vol. under

the general editorship of J. Pelikan and H.T. Lehmann

(Saint Louis, 1955-75)

Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop

of Canterbury, martyr, 1556, ed. for The Parker

Society by J.E. Cox(Cambridge, 1846)

Narratives of the days of the Reformation, ed. by J.G. Nichols

(Camden Society, Publications 77, 1859)

Newcourt, R., Repertorium Ecclesiasticum parochiale Londinense.

2 vols(London, 1708-10)

Original Letters relative to the English Reformation, written during the reigns of King Henry VIII. King Edward VI and Queen Mary: chiefly from the archives of Zurich.  
ed. in 2 vols by H. Robinson for The Parker Society  
(Cambridge, 1846-7)

Owen, D.M., A Catalogue of Lambeth Manuscripts 889 to 901  
(Carte Antique et Miscellaneae)(London, 1968)

Pocock, N., Records of the Reformation: The Divorce 1527-1533  
2 vols(Oxford, 1870)

Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England  
10 Richard II 1386 - 33 Henry VIII 1542. ed. in  
7 vols by Sir H. Nicolas(London, 1834-7)

Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, ex autoritate primum  
Regis Henrici 8. inchoata: deinde per Regem  
Edouardum 6. prouecta, adauctaq; in hunc modum.  
atq; nunc ad pleniorum ipsarum reformationem in  
luce aedita. ed. by J. Foxe(London, 1571)

The Reformation of The Ecclesiastical Laws as attempted in the  
reigns of King Henry VIII. King Edward VI and Queen  
Elizabeth. a new ed. by E. Cardwell(Oxford, 1850)

The Register of Henry Chichele. ed. by E.F. Jacob and H.C.  
Johnson(Canterbury and York Society, 42, 45-7, 1937  
-47)

The Register of John de Trillek, bishop of Hereford. ed. by  
J.H. Parry(Canterbury and York Society, 8, 1910)

The Register of John Pecham. Archbishop of Canterbury 1279  
-1292. ed. in 2 vols by F.N. Davis, D.L. Douie et  
al.(Canterbury and York Society, 64-5, 1908-69)

The Register of Robert Hallum, Bishop of Salisbury 1407-17

ed. by J.M. Horn(Canterbury and York Society, 72,  
1977-79)

The Register of William Melton, archbishop of York 1317-1340

ed. by R.M.T. Hill and D. Robinson[2 vols to date]  
(Canterbury and York Society, 70-1, 1977-8)

The register, or rolls, of Walter Gray, lord archbishop of

York: with appendices of illustrative documents.

ed. by J. Raine(Surtees Society, 56, 1872)

The registers of Cuthbert Tunstall, bishop of Durham, 1530-59.

and James Pilkington, bishop of Durham, 1561-76

ed. by G. Hinde(Surtees Society, 161, 1952)

The Registers of Thomas Wolsey, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1518

-1523, John Clerke, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1523

-1541, William Knyght, Bishop of Bath and Wells,

1541-1547, and Gilbert Bourne, Bishop of Bath and

Wells, 1554-1559, ed. by H. Maxwell-Lyte(Somerset

Record Society, 55, 1940)

Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynt, episcoporum

Wintoniensium, ed. by H.E. Malden and H. Chitty

(Canterbury and York Society, 37, 1930)

Registrum Caroli Bothe, episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MDXVI-

-MDXXIV, ed. by A.T. Bannister(Cantilupe Society

and Canterbury and York Society, 28, 1921)

Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham, Archiepiscopi

Cantuariensis, ed. in 3 vols by C.T. Martin(Rolls

Series, 1882-5)

Registrum Johannis Whyte, episcopi Wintoniensis A.D. MDLVI

-MDLIX, ed. by H. Chitty(Canterbury and York Society,

16, 1914)

Registrum Matthei Parker: diocesis Cantuariensis, A.D. 1559-1575

transcribed and edited by E.M. Thompson and W.H. Frere  
(Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33)

Registrum Ricardi Mayew, episcopi Herefordensis, ed. by

A.T. Bannister(Canterbury and York Society, 27, 1921)

Registrum Thome Bourghier, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi

A.D. 1454-1486, ed. by F.R.H. du Boulay

(Canterbury and York Society, 54, 1957)

Rymer, T., Poedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque

generis acta publica, 20 vols(vols 16-20 ed. by  
R. Sanderson)(London, 1704-35)

Sampson, R., Oratio, printed in Strype, J., Ecclesiastical  
Memorials, 3 vols in 6(Oxford, 1822)

Sheils, W.J., Archbishop Grindal's Visitation, 1575: Comperta  
et Detecta Book(York, 1977)

State Papers...King Henry the Eighth, 11 vols(London, 1830-52)

Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford, 3 vols(London, 1853)

Statutes of the realm, compiled by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins,

J. Raithby et al., 11 vols(London, 1810-28)

Strype, J., Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols in 6(Oxford, 1822)

-- Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer, 3 vols(Oxford, 1848-54)

-- Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer  
(London, 1694)

Tudor Royal Proclamations, ed. in 3 vols by P.L. Hughes and

J.F. Larkin(New Haven, 1964-69)

The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552: with other

Documents set forth by authority in the reign of

Edward VI., ed. for The Parker Society by J. Ketley

(Cambridge, 1844)

Registrum Matthei Parker: diocesis Cantuariensis, A.D. 1559-1575

transcribed and edited by E.M. Thompson and W.H. Frere  
(Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33)

Registrum Ricardi Mayew. episcopi Herefordensis, ed. by

A.T. Bannister(Canterbury and York Society, 27, 1921)

Registrum Thome Bourghier, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi

A.D. 1454-1486, ed. by F.R.H. du Boulay

(Canterbury and York Society, 54, 1957)

Rymer, T., Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque

generis acta publica, 20 vols(vols 16-20 ed. by

R. Sanderson)(London, 1704-35)

Sampson, R., Oratio, printed in Strype, J., Ecclesiastical

Memorials, 3 vols in 6(Oxford, 1822)

Sheils, W.J., Archbishop Grindal's Visitation, 1575: Comperta

et Detecta Book(York, 1977)

State Papers...King Henry the Eighth, 11 vols(London, 1830-52)

Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford, 3 vols(London, 1853)

Statutes of the realm, compiled by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins,

J. Raithby et al., 11 vols(London, 1810-28)

Strype, J., Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols in 6(Oxford, 1822)

— Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer, 3 vols(Oxford, 1848-54)

— Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer

(London, 1694)

Tudor Royal Proclamations, ed. in 3 vols by P.L. Hughes and

J.F. Larkin(New Haven, 1964-69)

The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552: with other

Documents set forth by authority in the reign of

Edward VI, ed. for The Parker Society by J. Ketley

(Cambridge, 1844)



Registrum Matthei Parker: diocesis Cantuariensis. A.D. 1559-1575

transcribed and edited by E.M. Thompson and W.H. Frere  
(Canterbury and York Society, 35-6, 39, 1928-33)

Registrum Ricardi Mayew. episcopi Herefordensis. ed. by

A.T. Bannister (Canterbury and York Society, 27, 1921)

Registrum Thome Bourghier. Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi

A.D. 1454-1486. ed. by F.R.H. du Boulay

(Canterbury and York Society, 54, 1957)

Rymer, T., Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque

generis acta publica, 20 vols (vols 16-20 ed. by

R. Sanderson) (London, 1704-35)

Sampson, R., Oratio, printed in Strype, J., Ecclesiastical

Memorials, 3 vols in 6 (Oxford, 1822)

Sheils, W.J., Archbishop Grindal's Visitation, 1575: Comperta

et Detecta Book (York, 1977)

State Papers...King Henry the Eighth, 11 vols (London, 1830-52)

Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford, 3 vols (London, 1853)

Statutes of the realm, compiled by A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins,

J. Raithby et al., 11 vols (London, 1810-28)

Strype, J., Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols in 6 (Oxford, 1822)

-- Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer, 3 vols (Oxford, 1848-54)

-- Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer

(London, 1694)

Tudor Royal Proclamations, ed. in 3 vols by P.L. Hughes and

J.F. Larkin (New Haven, 1964-69)

The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552: with other

Documents set forth by authority in the reign of

Edward VI. ed. for The Parker Society by J. Ketley

(Cambridge, 1844)



Valor Ecclesiasticus, ed. in 6 vols by J. Caley and J. Hunter  
(London, 1810-34)

Visitation articles and injunctions of the period of the  
reformation, ed. by W.P.M. Kennedy and W.H. Frere,  
3 vols(Alcuin Club, Collections 14-16, 1910)

Warham's Defence, ed. by J. Moyes in The Dublin Review,  
CXIV(1894), pp. 401-14.

Wilkins, D., Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, 4 vols  
(London, 1737)

Wilson, J. M., The visitations and injunctions of Cardinal  
Wolsey and Archbishop Cranmer to the priory of  
Worcester in 1526 and [1534?] in English Historical  
Review, vol. XLI(1926), pp. 418-21

Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of  
Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, relative to the Sacrament  
of the Lord's Supper, ed. for The Parker Society by  
J.E. Cox(Cambridge, 1844)

Wriothesley, C., A chronicle of England during the reigns  
of the Tudors, ed. by W.D. Hamilton(Camden Society,  
New Series, XI, XX, 1875-7)

#### SECONDARY SOURCES IN PRINT

Alexander, H.G., Religion in England 1558-1662(London, 1968)

Bailey, A., 'A legal view of Cranmer's execution' in English  
Historical Review, VII(1892), pp. 466-70

Bainton, R.H., Here I stand(London, 1951)

Barnes, A.S., Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders: A Study of  
the Original Documents(London, 1922)

Baskerville, G., English Monks and the suppression of the monasteries(London, 1937)

Baumer, F. le van, 'The Church of England and the common corps of Christendom' in Journal of Modern History, XVI no.1(March, 1944), pp. 1-21

-- The early Tudor theory of Kingship(New Haven, 1940)

Beer, B.L., Northumberland: the political career of John Dudley, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland (Kent[Ohio], 1973)

Belloc, J.H.P., Cranmer(London, 1931)

Bindoff, S.T., The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1509-1558, 3 vols(London, 1982)

-- Tudor England(Harmondsworth, 1950)

Bowker, M., 'The Henrician Reformation and the Parish Clergy' in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, L(1977), pp. 30-47.

-- The Henrician Reformation: The diocese of Lincoln under John Longland(Cambridge, 1981)

-- The Secular Clergy in the diocese of Lincoln 1495-1520 (Cambridge, 1968)

-- 'The Supremacy and the Episcopate: The Struggle for Control, 1534-40' in The Historical Journal, vol. XVIII.2(1975), pp. 227-43

Bradshaw, B., 'The Beginnings of Modern Ireland' in The Irish Parliamentary Tradition, ed. by B. Farrell (Dublin, 1973)

Brady, W.M., The episcopal Succession in England, Scotland and Ireland A.D. 1400 to 1875, 3 vols(Rome, 1876-77)

Brandi, K., The Emperor Charles V, translated into English

- by C.V. Wedgwood(London, 1939)
- Brigden, S., 'Tithe Controversy in Reformation London' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 32(1981), pp. 285-301
- Brightman, F.E., The English Rite, 2nd rev. ed., 2 vols (Farnborough, 1970)
- 'The Litany under Henry VIII' in English Historical Review, XXIV(1909), pp. 101-4.
- Briquet, C.M., Les Filigranes, 4 vols, a new edition under the supervision of A. Stevenson(Amsterdam, 1968)
- Bromiley, G.W., Thomas Cranmer. Archbishop and martyr(London, 1956)
- Thomas Cranmer, theologian(London, 1956)
- Brook, V.J.K., A Life of archbishop Parker(Oxford, 1962)
- Whitgift and the English Church(London, 1957)
- Brooke, C.N.L., Marriage in Christian History[Inaugural Lecture as Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History](Cambridge, 1978)
- Brooks, P.N., 'The Principle and Practice of Primitive Protestantism in Tudor England: Cranmer, Parker and Grindal as Chief pastors 1535-1577' in Reformation Principle and Practice, ed. by P.N. Brooks (London, 1980), pp. 119-33
- Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist; an essay in historical development(London, 1965)
- 'Visitor: Luther as Visitor' in Seven-Headed Luther: Essays in Commemoration of a Quincentenary 1483-1983, ed. by P.N. Brooks(Oxford, 1983), pp.148-63
- Burbidge, E., Liturgies and Offices of the Church(London, 1885)

- Remains of the library of T. Cranmer[extracted from  
Contributions towards a dictionary of English book-  
collectors. pt 1][London, 1892]
- Bush, M.L., The Government Policy of Protector Somerset  
 (London, 1975)
- The Canterbury and York Society[Annual Bulletin], 1983(none  
 given, 1983)
- Catalogue of Western MSS. in the old Royal and King's  
Collections, compiled by Sir G.F. Warner and J.P.  
 Gilson, 4 vols(London, 1921)
- Chadwick, W.O., The Reformation(Harmondsworth, 1964)
- Cheney, C.R., English Bishops' Chanceries 1100-1250(Manchester,  
 1950)
- Handbook of Dates for Students of English History, ed. for  
 The Royal Historical Society(London, 1978)
- Christian Spirituality, ed. by P.N. Brooks(London, 1975)
- Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I, ed. by  
 F. Heal and R. O'Day(London, 1977)
- Churchill, I.J., 'The Archbishops' Registers' in Mediaeval  
Records of the Archbishops of Canterbury(London, 1962),  
 pp. 11-20
- Canterbury Administration, 2 vols(London, 1933)
- Clark, P., English Provincial Society from the Reformation to  
the Revolution: Religion, Politics and Society in  
Kent 1500-1640(Hassocks, 1977)
- Cokayne, G., The complete peerage, new revised and enlarged ed.  
 by V. Gibbs et al.(London, 1910-59)
- Colette, C.H., The life, times and writings of Thomas Cranmer  
 (London, 1887)

Collinson, P., Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583: The Struggle for a reformed Church(London, 1979)

-- The Elizabethan Puritan Movement(London, 1967)

-- Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism  
(London, 1983)

Continuity and Change: Personnel and administration of the Church in England 1500-1642. ed. by R. O'Day and F. Heal(Leicester, 1976)

Cooper, J., 'The Supplication against the Ordinaries Reconsidered' in English Historical Review, vol. 72(1957), pp. 616-41

Cross, C., Church and People, 1450-1660: the triumph of the laity in the English Church(London, 1976)

-- 'Churchmen and the Royal Supremacy' in Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I. ed. by F. Heal and R. O'Day(London, 1977), pp. 15-34

Darby, H.S., Hugh Latimer(London, 1953)

Davies, C.S.L., 'Slavery and Protector Somerset; the Vagrancy Act of 1547' in The Economic History Review, Second Series, XIX, nos 1-3(1966), pp. 533-49

Davies, E.T., Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the Sixteenth Century(Oxford, 1950)

Davies, M., Cranmer's Godly Order: the destruction of Catholicism through Liturgical Change(Chawleigh, 1977)

Davis, J.F., 'Joan of Kent, Lollardy and the English Reformation' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 33 no. 2 (1982), pp. 225-33

-- 'Lollardy and the Reformation in England' in Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte, vol. 73(1982), pp. 217-36

Dawley, P.M., John Whitgift and the Reformation(London, 1955)

- Deane, A.C., The Life of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury(London, 1927)
- Dibdin, L.T., English Church Law and Divorce(London, 1912)
- Dickens, A.G., The Age of Humanism and Reformation(London, 1977)
- The English Reformation(London, 1964)
- Lollards and Protestants in the diocese of York, 1509-58  
(London, 1959)
- Martin Luther and the Reformation(London, 1967)
- Reformation and society in sixteenth-century Europe  
(London, 1966)
- Robert Holgate: Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North(London, 1955)
- Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation(London, 1959)
- Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by L. Stephen and S. Lee  
72 vols(London, 1885-1913)
- Dillon, H.A., 'Calais and the Pale' in Archaeologia, vol. 53  
pt 2(Second Series vol. III pt 2), pp. 289-388
- Du Boulay, F.R.H., 'Archbishop Cranmer and the Canterbury temporalities' in English Historical Review, vol. 67  
(1952), pp. 19-36
- The Lordship of Canterbury(London, 1966)
- Duncan, G.I.O., The High Court of Delegates(Cambridge, 1971)
- Ebeling, G., Luther: an introduction to his thought, translated  
into English by R.A. Wilson(London, 1970)
- Elton, G.R., 'The Commons' Supplication of 1532: Parliamentary manoeuvres in the reign of Henry VIII' in English Historical Review, vol. LXVI(1951)
- 'The early Journals of the House of Lords' in English

- Historical Review, vol. 89(1974), pp. 481-512
- England 1200-1640(London, 1969)
  - England under the Tudors(London, 1955)
  - 'The evolution of a Reformation statute' in Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1974-83), II, pp. 82-106
  - Henry VIII, an essay in revision(Historical Association, Pamphlets, General Series, 51, 1962)
  - 'King or Minister? The man behind the Henrician Reformation' in History, New Series, XXXIX(1954), pp. 216-32
  - Policy and Police(Cambridge, 1972)
  - 'The political creed of Thomas Cromwell' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th Series, VI(1956), pp. 69-92
  - Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558(London, 1977)
  - Reform and Renewal(Cambridge, 1973)
  - Reformation Europe 1517-1559(London, 1963)
  - Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government: Papers and Reviews 1946-81, 3 vols(Cambridge, 1974-83)
  - 'Thomas Cromwell Redivivus' in Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte, vol. 68(1977), pp. 192-208
  - The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1982)
  - 'The Tudor Revolution: A Reply' in Past and Present, vol. 29 (December, 1964), pp. 26-49
  - The Tudor Revolution in Government(Cambridge, 1953)
  - Emden, A.B., A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500(Cambridge, 1963)
  - A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500, 3 vols(Oxford, 1957-59)



— A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford

A.D. 1501 to 1540(Oxford, 1974)

Eubel, C. et al., Hierarchia Catholica, vol. 1-(Padua, 1913-)

Ferguson, C.H., Naked to mine enemies(London, 1958)

Fletcher, A., Tudor Rebellions, 2nd ed.(Harlow, 1973)

Forman, J.P., 'Cranmer, Tudor Diplomacy and Primitive Discipline' in Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, ed. by C.S. Meyer, vol. 1-(Saint Louis, [none given]), II, pp. 108-18

Foster, J., Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714, 4 vols(Oxford, 1891-2)

Fowler, R.C., Episcopal Registers of England and Wales(London, 1918)

Gairdner, J., 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester' in English Historical Review, XIX(1904), pp. 98-121

— Lollardy and the Reformation in England, 4 vols(London, 1908-13)

Garrett, C.H., 'The legatine register of Cardinal Pole, 1554-7' in Journal of Modern History, vol. XIII(1941), pp. 189-94

Gilpin, W., The Life of Thomas Cranmer(London, 1784)

Grace Books[of Cambridge University] ed. by S.M. Leathes and M. Bateson, 4 vols in 5(Cambridge, 1897-1910)

Green, V.H.H., Renaissance and Reformation, 2nd ed., reprinted and revised(London, 1974)

Guy, J.A., 'The Tudor Commonwealth: Revising Thomas Cromwell' in Historical Journal, vol. 23. 3(1980), pp. 681-7

Haigh, C., Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire (London, 1975)

Handbook of British Chronology, ed. by F.M. Powicke and E.B. Fryde, 2nd ed.(London, 1961)

Hardwick, C., A History of the Articles of Religion, 3rd ed. rev. by F. Procter(London, 1876)



- Harriss, G.L., 'Medieval Government and Statecraft' in Past and Present. vol. 25(July, 1963), pp. 3-39
- Heal, F., 'The Archbishops of Canterbury and the Practice of Hospitality' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History. vol. 33 no. 4(October, 1982), pp. 544-63
- 'Clerical tax collection under the Tudors: the influence of the Reformation' in Continuity and Change. ed. by R. O'Day and F. Heal(Leicester, 1976), pp. 103-11
- Of Prelates and Princes: A study of the economic and social position of the Tudor episcopate(Cambridge, 1980)
- Heath, P., The English parish clergy on the eve of the Reformation (London, 1969)
- Hector, L.C., The Handwriting of English documents, 2nd ed. (London, 1966)
- Hibbert, C., George IV: Prince of Wales(Newton Abbot, 1973)
- Hoak, D.E., The King's Council in the reign of Edward VI (Cambridge, 1976)
- 'Rehabilitating the Duke of Northumberland: Politics and Political Control, 1549-53' in The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540-1560. ed. by J. Loach and R. Tittler(London, 1980), pp. 29-51
- Holdsworth, W.S., A History of English Law. 17 vols(London, 1938-72)
- Hooper, W., 'The Court of Faculties' in English Historical Review. vol. XXV(1910), pp. 670-86
- Houlbrooke, R., Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation 1520-1570(Oxford, 1979)
- Hughes, P., The Reformation in England. 3 vols(London, 1950-4)
- Hunnisett, R.F., Editing Records for Publication(London, 1977)

Hutchinson, F.E., Cranmer and the English Reformation(London, 1951)

Innes, A.D., Cranmer and the Reformation in England(Edinburgh, 1900)

Jack, S., 'The Last Days of the Smaller Monasteries in England' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 21(1970), pp. 97-124

Jacob, E.F., The Mediaeval Registers of Canterbury and York (London, 1953)

James, M.R., A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. 2 vols(Cambridge, 1912)

Jenkins, C., 'Bishop Barlow's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's Register: with some new documents' in Journal of Theological Studies XXIV(October, 1922), pp. 1-32

— 'Cardinal Morton's Register' in Tudor Studies, ed. by R.W. Seton-Watson(London, 1924), pp. 26-74

Kelly, M.J., 'The Submission of the Clergy' in Transactions of The Royal Historical Society, XV[Fifth Series] (1965), pp. 97-119

Kennedy, W.P.M., Archbishop Parker(London, 1908)

Kitching, C.J., 'The Probate Jurisdiction of Thomas Cromwell as Vicegerent' in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. XLVI no 113(May, 1973), pp. 102-6

Knowles, D., and Hadcock, R.N., Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales(London, 1953)

— The Religious Orders in England. 3 vols(Cambridge, 1948-59)

Lander, S., 'Church courts and the Reformation in the diocese of Chichester, 1500-1558' in Continuity and Change

- ed. by R. O'Day and F. Heal(Leicester, 1976),  
pp. 215-37
- Le Bas, C.W., The Life of Archbishop Cranmer, 2 vols(London,  
1833)
- Lee, H.F., The Life and Times of Thomas Cranmer(Boston, 1841)
- Lehmberg, S.E., The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII 1536-47  
(Cambridge, 1977)
- The Reformation Parliament 1529-1536(Cambridge, 1970)
- 'Supremacy and vicegerency: a re-examination' in English  
Historical Review, CCCXIX(April, 1966), pp. 225-35
- Le Neve, J., Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541, 12 vols  
revised and expanded(London, 1962-7)
- Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857, vol. 1-, revised  
and expanded(London, 1969-)
- Levine, M., Bibliographical Handbooks: The Tudor Age, 1485-1603  
(Cambridge, 1968)
- Loades, D.M., The Oxford Martyrs(London, 1970)
- The reign of Mary Tudor(London, 1979)
- Loane, M.L., Masters of the English Reformation(London, 1954)
- Logan, F.D., 'The Henrician Canons' in Bulletin of the Institute  
of Historical Research, vol. XLVII(1974), pp. 99-103
- McConica, J.K., English Humanists and Reformation Politics  
under Henry VIII and Edward VI(Oxford, 1965)
- Maitland, F.W., Roman Canon Law in the Church of England  
(London, 1898)
- Major, K., A Handlist of the records of the bishop of Lincoln  
and of the archdeacons of Lincoln and Stowe(London, 1953)
- Makower, F., The Constitutional History and Constitution of the  
Church of England(London, 1895)

- Marchant, R.A., The Church under the Law(Cambridge, 1969)
- Marshall, W., The Story of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury  
(Edinburgh, 1876)
- Martin, R.G., Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury([none given], 1939)
- Mason, A.J., Thomas Cranmer(London, 1898)
- Mason, O., Bartholomew: Gazetteer of Britain(Edinburgh, 1977)
- Maxwell-Lyte, H.C., Historical Notes on the use of the Great Seal of England(London, 1926)
- Maynard, T., The Life of Thomas Cranmer(London, 1956)
- The Mid-Tudor Polity c.1540-1560, ed. by J. Loach and R. Tittler(London, 1980)
- Morris, C., The Tudors(London, 1955)
- Munby, A.N.L., Cambridge College Libraries, 2nd ed. revised and enlarged(Cambridge, 1962)
- Noonan, J.T., 'Marital affection in the canonists' in Studia Gratiana, vol. XII, pp. 481-509
- Offer, C.J., The Bishop's Register(London, 1929)
- Ordnance Survey, Map of Monastic Britain:(South Sheet) 2nd ed.(1954)
- Owen, D.M., Ely Records([none given], 1971)
- Medieval Records in Print: Bishops' Registers(London, 1982)
- The records of the Established Church in England, excluding parochial records(London, 1970)
- The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. by F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, 2nd ed.(London, 1974)
- Oxley, J.E., The Reformation in Essex to the death of Mary  
(Manchester, 1965)

Palliser, D.M., The Reformation in York. 1534-1553 (York, 1971)

Parker, T.M., The English Reformation to 1558, 2nd ed.  
(London, 1966)

Pilgrim Trust Survey of Ecclesiastical Archives [copies of this  
list have been deposited at The British Library,  
Lambeth Palace Library, The Bodleian Library, Oxford,  
and Cambridge University Library]

Pill, D.H., 'The administration of the Diocese of Exeter under  
Bishop Veysey' in Transactions of the Devon Association,  
XCVIII(1966), pp. 262-78

-- The English Reformation 1529-58 (London, 1973)

Pollard, A.F., Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation 1489-1556,  
new edition (London, 1926)

-- Wolsey (London, 1929)

Porter, H.C., Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge  
(Cambridge, 1958)

Potter, G.R., Zwingli (Cambridge, 1976)

Price, F.D., 'Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper' in  
Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucester  
Archaeological Society, LX(1939), pp. 51-151

Procter, F., A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, with  
a Rationale of its offices, by F. Procter and W.H.  
Frere, 3rd impression [with revisions] (London, 1905)

Purvis, J.S., An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Records  
(London, 1953[1954])

-- 'The Registers of Archbishops Lee and Holgate' in  
Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XIII (October, 1962),  
pp. 186-94

Ratcliff, E.C., The booke of common prayer of the Church of England: its making and revisions M.D. xlix-M.D. clxi(London, 1949)

— 'The liturgical work of Archbishop Cranmer' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. VII(1956), pp. 189-203

The Reformation Crisis, ed. by J. Hurstfield(London, 1965)

Reformation Principle and Practice, ed. by P.N. Brooks(London, 1980)

Report on editing historical documents, in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. I, pp. 6-25

Ridley, J.G., Thomas Cranmer(Oxford, 1962)

Rodes, R.E., Ecclesiastical Administration in Medieval England: The Anglo-Saxons to the Reformation(Notre Dame, 1977)

— Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church: Edward I to the Civil War(Notre Dame, 1982)

Rupp, E.G., Six makers of English Religion, 1500-1700(London, 1957)

— Studies in the making of the English Protestant tradition (Cambridge, 1947)

Russell, G., The Crisis of Parliaments(Oxford, 1971)

Sargant, J.A., The Life of Archbishop Cranmer(London, 1829)

Scarisbrick, J.J., 'Clerical Taxation in England 1485-1547' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 11(1960), pp. 41-54

— Henry VIII(London, 1968)

— 'Henry VIII and the Vatican Library' in Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance, vol. 24(1962), pp. 211-16

— 'The Pardon of the Clergy, 1531' in The Cambridge Historical Journal, vol. XII(1956), pp. 22-39

- The Reformation and the English People(Oxford, 1984)
- Schofield, B., 'The Yelverton Manuscripts' in British Museum Quarterly, vol. XIX(1954), pp. 3-9
- Selwyn, D.G., 'A Neglected Edition of Cranmer's Catechism' in Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, vol. XV, pt I(1964), pp. 76-91
- Seventh Report of the Deputy Keeper of Public Records(London, 1846)
- Simon, J., Education and society in Tudor England(Cambridge, 1966)
- Smith, D.M., Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales (London, 1981)
- A Guide to the Archive Collections in the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research(York, 1973)
- Medieval Latin Documents, Series I: Diocesan Records (York, 1979)
- 'The York Institution act books: diocesan registration in the sixteenth century' in Archives, vol. 13(1977-8), pp. 171-9
- Smith, H.M., Henry VIII and the Reformation(London, 1948)
- Pre-Reformation England(London, 1938)
- Spalding, J.C., 'The Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum of 1552 and the Furthering of Discipline in England' in Church History, vol. 39(1970), pp. 162-71
- Stephens, W.P., The Holy Spirit in the theology of Martin Bucer (Cambridge, 1970)
- Storey, R.L., Diocesan Administration in fifteenth-century England, second edition(York, 1972)
- Stubbs, W., 'Archbishop Holdegate's Pall' in Gentleman's Magazine for 1860, pt ii, pp. 522-4
- Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, 2nd ed.(Oxford, 1897)



Studies in the Reformation: Luther to Hooker, ed. by C.W.

Dugmore(London, 1980)

Thompson, A.H., The English Clergy and their organization in the Later Middle Ages(Oxford, 1947)

Todd, H.J., A Catalogue of the Archiepiscopal Manuscripts in the Library at Lambeth Palace(London, 1812)

— The Life of Archbishop Cranmer, 2 vols(London, 1831)

Tyler, R., The Emperor Charles the Fifth(London, 1956)

Venn, J. and J.A., Alumni Cantabrigienses: Part I. to 1751, 4 vols(Cambridge, 1922-7)

The Victoria History of the counties of England, ed. by

A.H. Doubleday et. al. (London etc., 1900-)

Wendel, F., Calvin: the origins and development of his religious thought, translated into English by P. Mairet(London, 1963)

Whitaker, E.C., Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer (Alcuin Club Collections, 55, 1974)

Whiting, R., 'Abominable Idols: Images and Image Breaking under Henry VIII' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 33(1982), pp. 30-47

Williams, C.H., William Tyndale(London, 1969)

Williams, P., 'A Revolution in Tudor History?' in Past and Present, vol. 25(July, 1963), pp. 3-8

— 'The Tudor State' in Past and Present, vol. 25(July, 1963), pp. 39-58

Williamson, D.M., 'Sede Vacante Records of the Diocese of Lincoln' in Bulletin of the Society of Local Archivists, 12(October, 1953), pp. 13-20



Woodcock, B.L., Medieval Ecclesiastical Courts in the diocese of Canterbury(London, 1952)

Youngs, J., The Dissolution of the Monasteries(London, 1971)

Zeeveld, W.G., Foundations of Tudor policy(London, 1948)

Zell, M.L., 'The personnel of the clergy in Kent, in the Reformation period' in English Historical Review, vol. 89(1974), pp. 513-33

— 'The Prebendaries' plot of 1543: a reconsideration' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 27(1976), pp. 241-53

#### SECONDARY SOURCES IN MANUSCRIPT

Alexander, G.M.V., The Life and Career of Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, until his deprivation in 1549  
(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of London, 1960)

Brigden, S., The Early Reformation in London, 1520-47: the conflict in the parishes(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1979)

Brooks, P.N., Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the sacraments  
(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1960)

Edwards, A.J., The sede vacante Administration of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, 1533-53(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the M. Phil. degree, university of London, 1968)

Heal, F., The Bishops of Ely and their Diocese during the

Reformation Period, 1515-1600(Unpublished  
dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree,  
university of Cambridge, 1972)

Kelly, M.J., Canterbury Jurisdiction and Influence during the  
episcopate of William Warham, 1503-32(Unpublished  
dissertation submitted for the Ph. D. degree,  
university of Cambridge, 1963)

Lander, S.J., The Diocese of Chichester, 1508-1558: Episcopal  
Reform under Robert Sherburne and its Aftermath  
(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the Ph. D  
degree, university of Cambridge, 1974)

Scarisbrick, J.J., The Conservative Episcopate in England, 1529  
-1535(Unpublished dissertation submitted for the  
Ph. D. degree, university of Cambridge, 1956)

UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
CAMBRIDGE